DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 648 EA 004 269

AUTHOR	Friedman, Burton D.
TITLE	State Government and Education: Management in the State Education Agency.
INSTITUTION	Public Administration Service, Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	114p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Public Administration Service, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60637 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Agencies; *Agency Role; Educational Administration; Educational Objectives; Federal State Relationship; *Management; *Management Development; Management Systems; Public Policy; Staff Improvement; *State Departments of Education; State Government; *State Officials; Systems Analysis

ABSTRACT

This document focuses on the State education agency and the requirements for its management within the statutory and policy limits of each State. The agency is primarily a public service agency designed to recognize and solve educational problems, to implement solutions, and to allocate available resources at the optimum level. Recent developments in systems thinking have instigated changes in public administration theory, and this report lists 12 management processes especially applicable to education agency management derived from those developments. These processes include anticipating futures, planning, programing, financing, budgeting, controlling, organizing, staffing, administering, evaluating, relationship building, and developing institutions. Depending on the needs of each State, three approaches to management improvement that may prove useful are (1) improving staff; (2) improving the management systems complex; and (3) improving and clarifying goals, priorities, and programs. (RA)

ED 061648

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

State Government and Education:

Management in the State Education Agency

by

BURTON D. FRIEDMAN

Principal Associate

Public Administration Service

EA 004 269

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SERVICE
1313 East 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60637

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Public Administration Service TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Printed in the United States of America
Library of Congress: 70-173681

Copyrighted 1971
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SERVICE

Portions of this monograph were prepared under a U.S. government contract. Permission is granted to domestic persons in the United States for use of this work without charge providing proper author and publisher credits are given. Reproduction or other use of this report, in whole or in part, is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government. (This monograph is not a product of the U.S. Office of Education. It does not carry the USOE's endorsement, and it does not necessarily express the Office's view of state education agency and its place in contemporary education in the United States.)

Foreword

An earlier, shorter, and less complete version of this monograph was commissioned by the U.S. Office of Education's Division of State Agency Cooperation (a part of the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education). That earlier essay was one of several papers used to acquaint USOE staff members with that significant group of USOE's "clients" and partners known as "state education agencies." The essay was helpful in that initial use. In its present form, we think that it will be informative for a wider audience. And if that wider audience finds it helpful, we will be pleased that an extra benefit has been yielded by the contract of several years ago between the Office of Education and Public Administration Service.

Aside from that historical connection, this monograph is not a product of the Office of Education. It does not necessarily express the Office's view of the state education agency and its place in contemporary education in the United States.

On the other hand, its publication occurs with the good wishes of the Office of Education in at least this one respect: state education agencies are strategically located components of American education, their effectiveness is important to a wide range of governmental endeavors which affect education, and they have received far too little attention and serious study in the past. From my vantage point within the Office of Education, it seems clear enough that they deserve far more attention. So, I applaud each serious examination of them that appears and each serious effort to contribute to the needed body of literature about them.

Some substantial part of the literature on state education agencies has been stimulated, commissioned, or financed by the U.S. Office of Education and by the Division which I direct. The Office can take considerable satisfaction from the facts that, with its help, the state education agencies have become bigger and better, and the literature of state education agencies has been enriched by the contributions of SEA staff members, scholars, and consultants. I hope that the SEAs continue to become better and that the literature becomes progressively more complete and useful.

At the invitation of the author, we have prepared a brief listing which appears as an appendix to this monograph. In it we have attempted to indicate the breadth and variety of comparatively recent attention to the examination and improvement of state education agencies, and we have attempted to be helpful to the reader who wishes to learn more about those agencies. Much of the pertinent material is ephemeral or fugitive literature which may, unfortunately, not appear in the usual bibliographic files. In preparing this appendix, therefore, we have emphasized precisely those materials that a library search might not turn up.

Harry L. Phillips, ***Director***
Division of State Agency Cooperation
U.S. Office of Education

Preface

The numbers of people involved in it, the numbers of dollars expended on it, and other criteria point to public education as the largest enterprise in the United States. As the largest component in the public sector it would seem that it might properly be considered within the field of public administration. However, the field of education administration has attracted only limited attention from the public administration profession or its literature. Persons prepared to be professionals in public administration have been a small minority among those administering public education. It is a moot point, perhaps, as to whether this has derived from tepidness of interest among the former or coolness of welcome from the latter. Whatever the answers to conjectures about reasons in the past, for this dichotomy in the administration of the public sector it seems clear that parochialism holds no prospect of benefit to the public in the future.

Public Administration Service was established in 1933 to provide consulting, research, publishing, and other services to government. With an awareness that much of what has been learned about administration in one part of the public sector often can be utilized advantageously in another, its program has long extended to the full range of governmental activity, including educational agencies and institutions. Reflective of this rationale is *State Government and Education,* a substantially revised and expanded version of a paper commissioned by the U. S. Office of Education. It was utilized in its original form as a part of the training materials supplied to USOE personnel engaged in "management reviews" of state education agencies. In its present form it may be of interest to a substantially wider audience: the subject under examination is "state government" or "public administration" just as fully as it is "education."

The author was assisted in the preparation and later revision of this monograph by various members of the staff of Public Administration Service and by others at the U. S. Office of Education or in state education agencies. He acknowledges their advice, criticisms, and assistance with deep appreciation. Also, Public Administration Service is indebted to the U. S. Office of Education for its courtesy, permission, and encouragement in the transformation of the paper it originally commissioned into this publication.

H. G. POPE, ***President***
Public Administration Service and
Governmental Affairs Institute

Table of Contents

Foreword

Preface

I. THE PROBLEM AND THE SETTING 1

The Statewide Educational System 4
The State Education Agency 5

II. AGENCY "MISSION, ACTIVITIES, AND FUNCTIONS" 14

The State's "Mission" in Education 14
The Agency's "Mission" in Education 16
"Leadership" and "Service" 23
The Seventh Function 26
Significance of Federal Action 28

III. A SYSTEM OF MANAGEMENT PROCESSES 35

The Processes 37
The Ongoing Enterprise 41
Tiers of Management 42
Processes Viewed Singly 43

IV. CONDITIONS AND TRENDS IN PUBLIC MANAGEMENT . . . 54

Trends in Management 54
A Systems View of Agency Management 59
Management Redefined 62
Management Process Redefined 73

V. ACTIVATING AND IMPROVING MANAGEMENT PROCESSES 77

Three Approaches to Management Improvement 79
Approach No. 1. Improving Staff 80
Approach No. 2: Improving the Management Systems Complex 82
Approach No. 3: Improving and Clarifying Goals, Priorities, and Programs 87
Summary: Management Use of Processes 97

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTES 101

I.

The Problem and the Setting

Education, educational processes, and the educational efforts of society both merit and receive enormous amounts of attention and study. They also receive immense investments of emotion, affection, dedication, and resources. Education may be subjected to philosophic, sociological, psychological, pedagogical, economic, political, and other varieties of analysis. Through a wide-angle lens, education may be viewed in terms of its significance to the individual and his self-fulfillment, to the economy and its expansion, or to society and the enhancement of the quality of life. Education may be examined also in terms of its institutions, methodologies, resources, and services. It may be regarded as an industry.

In this monograph, the wide-angle lens is temporarily set aside in order to focus upon the state education agency. Each state of the Union has established such an agency,[1] which is at once a major unit of state government and a significant entity within the total set of arrangements for educational activity serving the public.

---

[1] *Terminology varies among states. "State education agency" (SEA) is the generic term for a state's major department of "education" or "public instruction." An SEA is headed by a "chief state school officer" (CSSO) whose title may be secretary, commissioner, or superintendent. The SEA may contain or be otherwise related to a board of education. In general, "state education agency" is used in this paper to mean the board (if any), the CSSO, and the entire SEA staff.*

Given the broad panorama of education, the state education agency does not bulk very large in terms of sheer size. In terms of significance—–both real and potential—–it looms much larger, however, for reasons to be considered below. The agency therefore merits attention and study. It can be examined from various points of view: what it is for; what it does; how well it performs; what effect it has upon other educational institutions; how it relates to the remainder of state government; whether its effects upon academic standards and professional practice are constructive; and so forth. For purposes of this monograph, however, most of those viewpoints are set aside (or—–to use the metaphor one final time—–those matters are in the background, in camera range but not in clear focus), and the essay is not a comprehensive treatise on "the public administration of a state education agency."

Attention is directed to only one aspect of the state education agency: *the requirements for its management,* within the limits of constitutional, statutory, and gubernatorial authorizations for the agency to act.

Management may be viewed as a portion of the institution's total capability: the portion both expected and required to select, provide, maintain, and improve or enhance arrangements for effective delivery of appropriate public services. The agency is a vehicle for delivery of services, and management controls and directs the vehicle.

In major part, management capability is embodied in certain persons within the institution; in part, however, it is built deliberately into institutional processes, procedures, and facilities. The term "management" refers both to the set of individuals (as in such usages as "The Management" or "top management") and to their use of the set of institutionalized managerial arrangements.

For purposes of examination (but only for such purposes), management may be considered as separate from "operation" and from "agency performance." Whatever the operation in question and whatever its scope or cost or methodology, the *management* problem is to elect when and whether to authorize such operation and—when it has been decided to proceed—to provide, maintain, and improve arrangements whereby the agency's performance will deliver the desired public services effectively.

To conduct operations and to perform the agency's delivery of public service, the talents of specialists, experts, or technicians may be needed. They should be "knowledgeable" about the operation at hand; they must be "skilled" at performing such operations.

The agency's management also must be "knowledgeable," but about the nature and needs of the governmental and educational enterprise, not especially about a particular type of educational operation. Management also must be "skillful," but in the use of the institutionalized managerial arrangements, not necessarily in performing the specific operation.

The focus here is on management aspects of educational problems, not on their substantive content or on the proposals for their solution. (Although reference may be made to substantive questions for purposes of discussion, this essay is intended to be "policy-neutral" with respect to the solutions to educational problems.) Management aspects include anticipating or swiftly recognizing problems; setting the wheels in motion to find solutions rather than await crises; and making it possible for solutions to be applied, i.e., for useful public services to be delivered. Resources are never sufficient to support doing all the good things there are to do, nor to support them at the optimum level. Therefore, the search for advantageous ways to allocate the available resources is always a major management obligation and preoccupation.

To be sure, management people as individuals may be experienced professionals who are, in their own right, "experts" regarding the educational content of particular problems; they even may be inventors of usable solutions. But their *management* obligations center around seeing to it that public services are delivered when and where needed, in useful form, and with constructive impact.

Accordingly, the following pages are not intended to identify or resolve contemporary issues in the aims, content, or style of education. The intent is to illuminate the matter of management, with specific reference to the state education agency; and to suggest how suitable management arrangements may enable the agency to be most useful and constructive, vis-a-vis both education and state government.

This monograph has been prepared in essay form, largely without citations and footnotes, in an effort to make it readable as well as informative. Nevertheless, the subject is treated both broadly and in depth. The treatment is based, of course, upon a review of the state of the managerial arts or sciences as manifested in the contemporary practice and contemporary literature of business and government. Furthermore, it reflects some institutional judgments, based on management studies performed in many and varied public institutions and jurisdictions.

THE STATEWIDE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Education services in the United States are delivered to their clientele by hosts of public and private agencies and institutions. For some purposes, it is useful to regard the domestic educational universe as a single integrated whole or——anticipating later discussion of the "systems approach"——as a single system with nationwide boundaries. For other purposes, it also is useful to abstract smaller systems from that universe. These are examples of such systems: higher education in the United States; technical-vocational-industrial education in New England; teacher education in North Dakota; or the public school system of a given village, city, county, state, or other political jurisdiction or geographical area.

Our concern here is with the state education agency, and therefore is partly with "the statewide educational system" of a state: from border to border; from prekindergarten to post-doctorate; rural, suburban, urban; public and private; liberalizing and civilizing education as well as work-oriented education and training; curricular considerations of all varieties, subject matters, instructional methodologies, media, materials, technologies, and all the rest, including "co-curricular" questions; various physical and mental considerations, including matters of health, nutrition, condition, and athletic skills; resources, whether financial, structural, environmental, or human; various sociological considerations, including such obvious matters as desegregation and resegregation, but extending also to educational and related problems of migrants, immigrants, ethnic groups, economic groupings, and others. The enumeration is by no means complete, of course; each special consideration of a statewide educational system may be taken either alone or in combination.

Some institutions and agencies are involved only incidentally with the educational system or devote themselves only to some of its parts. The state education agency, in contrast, is involved directly and deals with the entire statewide system; it must comport itself accordingly. That is, the state education agency addresses itself to questions of the health of the entire educational system in the state, and to the well-being of that system within the surrounding environment. The agency always must maintain the sense of proportion that stems from its awareness of the educational system and its setting as a whole, even though it may choose or be instructed to concentrate attention from time to time on vocational education, preschool education, whether Johnny can read, or any other topic.

THE STATE EDUCATION AGENCY

Public policy in the United States places the responsibility upon each state to establish and maintain a system of free public schools. Each state also acknowledges further responsibility for education. Within constitutional limits, plenary power to determine matters of basic state policy rests with the legislature; in general, execution of such policy is a responsibility of the governor as the state's chief executive.

Pursuant to these fundamentals of constitutional law, legislative policy, and gubernatorial obligations, the public administration of education is entrusted to state and local agencies of government.[2] Chief among these agencies, typically, are: a state board of education; a state superintendent, commissioner, or secretary and department of education; a number of local boards of education responsible for governance of districts that operate schools; and one or more boards of trustees, charged with governing elements of higher education, technical education, and other matters.

With respect to the public administration of education, some of these agencies may be engaged more clearly in "educational" work than in "governmental" activities. However, several other agencies, more clearly "governmental," also play major roles in the educational system of the state; these include, for example, the planning and budgeting units of state and local jurisdictions.

Each of these governmental agencies has an assigned mission. Each is assigned certain responsibilities by state government, and each is granted the authority to act. Ideally, the authority is precisely commensurate with the responsibilities for fulfillment of mission. When this is the case, state government can hold each agency accountable for its own performance of its assigned mission, for its fulfillment of its own assigned responsibilities, and for its exercise of allotted authority to proceed. In this essay, the mission of only the state education agency is at issue.

---

[2] *Further attention to this statement will be seen in Chapter II.*

Of the various governmental agencies, a state's board, superintendent, and department of education (hereafter referred to collectively as "state education agency") appear to have both the best opportunity and the greatest obligation to remain abreast of educational needs and developments in the state, to take an active part in educational governance within the state, and consequently to play a major educational leadership role within the state. The state's budgeting or planning agencies, for example, devote some attention to all elements of the state's educational design; but their attention is limited, because education is only one among many broad areas of their governmental interest. Local education boards, officials, and agencies are immersed exclusively in educational concerns, but they deal only with limited segments of educational operations (e.g., K-12) and only with reference to their own jurisdictions and constituencies. Units of higher education, although wholly immersed in educational concerns and sometimes on a statewide basis, are similarly constrained to concentrate their thought and effort on one segment of education.

Unique Advantages

The state education agency is unique among these entities. Unlike other more general departments of state government, its situation requires that it concentrate its efforts rather exclusively on education, not on other areas of life. Its situation also requires that it do so in a way that is comprehensive in two basic respects: first, comprehensive in the sense of statewide; second, comprehensive with respect to all of the various bases for specialization within education.

Logically, therefore, the state education agency is the point at which a state's governmental attention to education may be concentrated. No other agency of state government is so well situated with respect to the general area of education. No other educational institution or local agency, public or private, is so well situated with respect to all aspects of the educational design within all parts of the state. And no federal agency is so well situated with respect to educational needs, problems, and opportunities within one particular state.

Considerations of law, logic, and current practice apparently coincide. The state education agency normally is conceived to be state government's principal instrument for generating information about education, for developing governmental policy toward education, for attending to those educational matters that require regulation and licensing, for providing varied forms of technical assistance to local school agencies, for operating certain educational or quasi-educational institutions or facilities, for supplying material and financial resources to other agencies, and——in varying ways——for maintaining, improving, and enhancing the scope, quality, and utility of educational opportunities available within the state.

Federal legislation regarding education, to a very great extent, serves to expand this reliance upon the state education agency. The agency administers funds provided to the state by the federal government for the establishment, maintenance, enhancement, and evaluation of diverse state and local educational activities. Federal policy and activity recognize that education is a matter of national concern, but reaffirm that it is a state responsibility.[3] The national concern is made manifest by the federal government in supplying financial resources to the state government, which administers them largely through the state education agency.

Basic Characteristics of the Agency

Several basic characteristics may be noted. First, the state education agency is an arm of state government; therefore, it is engaged in public administration. Its field of endeavor is education; therefore, it also is an educational institution. It exists in order to pursue certain purposes; therefore, it is an enterprise rather than another type of social system.

---

[3] *Chapter II contains further attention to this point.*

Education is a central concern of state governments. The "knowledge industry" or the "education business" is the largest and, perhaps, still the fastest growing component of public expenditures, a fact that demonstrates governmental commitment to education of the citizenry in general and the young in particular. The state education agency, therefore, is not "fundamentally" in education and only "incidentally" in government. It is state government's basic instrument for expressing a fundamental governmental preoccupation. Just as firmly as it is "in education," the agency inherently is "in" government, public administration, and politics. It is inescapable that the agency must act accordingly, and must attend to its "public administration" responsibilities as fully and seriously as to the ostensibly more substantive problems, techniques, and policies of its responsibilities for "education."

Presumably, the agency is a relatively permanent fixture, rather than a temporary or *ad hoc* unit. Therefore, it develops institutional characteristics which persist through time, although modified by the succession of individuals who direct it or perform its responsibilities. Because it persists through time, the agency may be expected to retain certain basic purposes.

Nevertheless, it also must be expected to make adjustments and to adopt, alter, and abolish policies, priorities, and activities which, from time to time, are believed to be useful for the fulfillment of those basic purposes. Much of the need for "management" centers about the agency's problems in deciding what adaptations are needed and when or how to make them.

Summing up, the state education agency is an institutionalized, purposive enterprise that is very largely held responsible by state government for effective public administration of education. It exists in order to deliver (or assure delivery of) effective public services. However, it also is expected and required to help the state government determine which public services in education would be most appropriate. It has a three-fold mission, in fact: (1) to *advise* constituted authority (e.g., the state legislature) regarding the kind of education that should be sought; (2) when state policies, priorities, and standards have been set, to *ascertain* whether the desired conditions actually prevail statewide; and (3) to *assure* that inadequacies are corrected wherever they are encountered. In some cases, the mission of a state education agency has a fourth component: to *act* directly in operating schools and other elements of the statewide educational system.

The agency's obligation is considerable: to help decide what is "acceptable" in education and to help select that which is "appropriate" action by the agency itself. Typically, an agency is allowed and expected to help its legislature, governor, and governing board decide what they will "order" the agency to do. Woodrow Wilson, one of the subject's founding fathers, wrote that a prime objective in studying public administration is to "discover" what government "can properly and successfully do." With respect to government's "doing" in the broad area of education, a state education agency is obligated to share in the discovery. That is why it is authorized to help write its own orders. Perhaps it also explains why legislation on complex matters normally leaves large areas of discretion, in which an agency may choose among unspecified options regarding both policy and activity; and perhaps it is why legislation even may delegate the agency some quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial responsibility.

A Quick View of Agency Management

The enterprise called a state education agency exists basically to deliver, or see to the delivery of, effective public service. The agency's *management* exists basically to control and direct it. If the agency is a vehicle for delivery of services, management is its navigator and pilot. The agency's performance is intended to exert constructive influence on other segments of education, government, and society. Its *management* is intended to control and direct the agency's institutional behavior so that its performance and its influence will be vigorous, constructive, and persuasive.

Management deals with the deliberate introduction and use of change in agency activity. The agency is a bureaucracy, i.e., a large, complex organization with many institutionalized practices.

Management undertakes to control and direct the bureaucracy. Any bureaucracy can plow straight ahead at a fixed course and speed. A well-managed bureaucracy can vary both course and speed when circumstances make changes prudent or essential.

Management's problem is to overcome inertia or momentum: a bureaucracy at rest tends to remain at rest; a bureaucracy in motion tends to remain in motion, retaining both rate and direction.

Management's concerns center about the need to choose directions, to initiate motion, and to accelerate, decelerate, or halt specific activities in accordance with changing requirements of particular goals and objectives, and in accordance with the agency's mission in education and government.

Management deals with choices of objectives, course, and speed; with the stated mission of the agency; and with the related means for its achievement. What are the needs and problems? What should be done about them, how, by whom, and to what extent? What should this agency start to do? What should it discontinue?

Management must be willing and able to gain and retain the initiative. If not, agency managers do not engage in management; they simply occupy management positions, while inertia or momentum govern the agency.

Many individuals and institutions point out difficulties, advocate goals, and exhort others to do something. The unique characteristic of agency management is that it is in position *to cause something constructive to be done:* systematically to identify needs, problems, and resources; systematically to initiate actions that will move events step by step toward recognized goals.

There are no formulas or shortcuts available for fulfilling these management obligations and no royal road to a managerial education. It is not easy to launch a new enterprise and set it on course; it is more difficult to gain control over so well-established an enterprise as a state education agency and to change its course.

When an enterprise or activity has a good deal of momentum, it may control and direct the men engaged in it. But management is active, not passive; therefore, management questions the advisability of enterprise activities, considers alternatives, and undertakes to control and direct the course of events.

In one sense, management therefore is decision making, because individuals must decide which goals to pursue and decide with what means to accomplish chosen ends. Decision-making points are numerous, however, and arise in both the largest and most fundamental matters as well as in the smallest and most incidental. Management personnel are constrained to husband their decision-making potential and to act directly only in selected cases. Therefore, management does not equal decision making. Instead, management controls and directs the distribution of decision-making authority.

Decisions are made throughout the agency. Management decides directly when it elects one major course of action rather than another. The agency executes public policy as stated in law, but not mechanically or by rote. After all, the agency helps to develop public policy and to draft the law; and after policy has been formally expressed in law, countless large and small options are still available. Agency management exists to see to it that the options are suitably exercised, and top management remains accountable to other elements of state government for the way this is done. Although responsible for all decisions, top management cannot attempt or pretend to make them all. However, the management can see to it that decisions are made when needed and by the agency staff member best equipped to decide wisely.

To the extent that management "is" decision making, it necessarily is widely dispersed. This dispersion is encouraged by the fact that a state education agency is staffed very largely by "professional" personnel. A hallmark of the able professional is that he maintains control and direction of the activity at hand, is not overpowered by the activity, and views his own efforts with a critical eye. In these respects, every professional performs a management role in the agency.

Depending on the problem at hand, the decision maker may occupy a position which is labelled as executive, specialist, technician, or clerk. The very nature of the problem typically makes it clear who ought to be allowed to "call the shots." "The Management's" concern, in these respects, is to build an environment in which staff can function with efficacy. That environment is partly defined, so to speak, by the distribution of decision-making powers. Able professionals properly expect those powers to be rather widely dispersed; circumstances also dictate dispersion. Management must nevertheless "control and direct" the agency.

Therein lies the problem.

II.

Agency "Mission, Activities and Functions"

The state's department for education, whatever its proper name, is "the state education agency." It is headed by "the chief state school officer." The CSSO may be elected or appointed; he and the agency may be advised or directed by an elected or appointed board of education. The state education agency, notwithstanding these variations in detail, remains an executive department of state government. What may be termed the agency's basic "mission" can be derived directly from that fact.

THE STATE'S "MISSION" IN EDUCATION

Public education is a constitutional obligation of state government. In Hawaii, state government chose literally to operate the public schools. In the other states of the Union, state government delegates the bulk of that task to local school authorities. In many states, some policy-making and rule-making authority is delegated to the board or superintendent of the state education agency. In all cases, nevertheless, the constitutional obligation of the state government and the government's responsibility and authority remain intact. Some basic governmental questions are not delegated to local authorities, even where the operation of schools is so delegated; and limits are imposed on the state education agency's authority to establish policies or rules.

State government––notably the state legislature––retains and exercises the responsibility for deciding what will be deemed a satisfactory educational system, for deciding on a level and pattern of public financing and public expenditure in support of that system, and for deciding to whom to entrust which segments of the system. As state government does in other major areas of its responsibility, state government normally authorizes the creation of an executive department to act on its behalf in significant ways with respect to education.

The distinction between "the state" or "state government" and its creature, the state education agency, is significant. It may be said, for example, that state government "runs" the statewide system of public schools. State government can and does "call the shots" regarding the existence and the operations of the local school districts and other components of the statewide educational system. Because the agency is not autonomous, it is less accurate to declare that the state education agency runs the public schools. The state government can and does make the choices regarding the existence and the operations of its education agency––its executive department in the field of education––as readily as it can and does regarding the school districts, the state colleges or universities, and other entities.

The educational mission of state government, in other words, is not necessarily or automatically transferable to the state education agency. State government's educational mission derives from public policy embedded in constitution and statute. The state education agency is merely one instrument––albeit perhaps a most important instrument––employed by state government in pursuit of fulfillment of the government's mission. Other instruments––e.g., boards of higher education trustees, local school boards––also are utilized by state government to the same end. The legislature, the governor, and the judiciary are constituted to govern. A state education agency is a device established to assist them. If and when the state education agency's performance sufficiently satisfies, gratifies, and impresses duly constituted authorities, the agency may be the principal instrument utilized by state government in fulfilling its educational mission.

"Agency mission" therefore is separable from "government's mission," in that they are not identical or coterminous. Similarly, "agency goals or objectives" are not identical or coterminous with "the goals and objectives of education," hence are separable from them also.

A mission for a state education agency can be rather clearly discerned. It derives directly from its status as a department of state government.

THE AGENCY'S "MISSION" IN EDUCATION

An executive department's "mission" is its reason for existence, as distinguished from a list of the things it does or encourages. Whatever large and small tasks or duties may be assigned to it or selected by it, a state education agency performs those tasks and duties on behalf of the people of the state as represented in the state government. An attempt to define "mission" is a direct response to the question, "Why does state government choose to have an executive department in the education field, and what does state government expect of that department?" State governments appear to hold three basic expectations for their departments of education. Their fulfillment may be regarded as the usual state education agency's three-fold mission:

1. ***To advise*** state government on the conditions which government should require and should expect to prevail within the statewide educational system, and on the public

policies, priorities, standards, criteria, and actions needed to produce those conditions.

2. ***To ascertain*** whether the conditions stipulated by state government actually are being met in each school, school system, or other entity within the state education agency's purview.

3. ***To assure,*** by taking suitable actions, that unsatisfactory conditions are corrected wherever and whenever they are found to exist.

The several states have taken different positions regarding the scope and depth of the cognizance or surveillance to be maintained by government itself in the many aspects or elements of education. Accordingly, there are variations among states in the matters that are formally "within the agency's purview." Also, some states have assigned other specific tasks (example: to operate specified school, library, or other facilities) to their education agencies. The three phases of agency *mission* just enumerated appear to be essentially common in all states, however, even though the several state education agencies have selected or been assigned differing *tasks* and differing *activities*. The mission is the state government's reason to support an education agency.

Whatever the specific tasks and activities, the "mission" of a state education agency may be regarded as the state government's "desired outcomes" or "intended consequences" of the agency's performance. Satisfactory agency performance will (a) prompt and facilitate the constructive review and revision of state policy, (b) achieve the effective surveillance of schools, school districts, etc., and (c) bring about the timely correction of unsuitable conditions. Agency management, presumably, is oriented to the attainment of mission, and that orientation presumably guides management's decisions as it undertakes to control and direct the agency.

The agency's mission differs from and is subordinate to state government's mission in education, whatever that may be. The agency's mission also differs from and is supportive of the goals of education, whatever they may be.

Agency Activities

In order to bring about those *desirable consequences* called "mission," the management of a state education agency––the board, the CSSO, the principal staff––finds it necessary for the agency to perform a wide variety of activities. Before an agency can *advise* state government on matters of policy or priority, for example, the agency must complete its own homework on such matters. To *ascertain* whether conditions in each school or school system are adequate, the agency must perform activities calculated to equip it to make that determination. To *assure* the correction of deficiencies whenever and wherever encountered, the agency must act in ways that bring about constructive changes.

The state education agency employs a staff of people who presumably have competence and qualifications appropriate to the agency's mission. Subject to the initiative or approval of the agency's board and chief, the staff conceives and performs dozens or scores or hundreds of activities, each of which––whether long-term or short, perennial or *ad hoc,* difficult or simple––presumably is so congruent with the agency's mission that its skillful performance will contribute positively to the fulfillment of one or more phases of the mission.

Agency activities greatly outnumber the three phases of agency mission, obviously. The relationship between mission and activity is not one to one in any sense: each phase of the mission may be advanced by many more than one activity; and each activity may bear on any or all phases of the mission. Furthermore, the connection between an activity and the mission may be obscure or remote, because fulfillment of the mission is remote and in a fundamental sense not attainable. Perhaps it is for such reasons that the Council of Chief State

School Officers, among others, have made reference to the "functions" of state education agencies.

Agency Functions

The term "function" competes with the term "program" as a source of terminological confusion. Various meanings are attributed to "function" and "function" is employed to mean different things. As sociologist Robert K. Merton points out in *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957, especially pp. 19ff.), "function" has been made to appear synonymous with "use, utility, purpose, motive, intention, aim, consequences" and possibly others. The term is common in discussions of state education agencies. Several sets of "functions" have been set forth and several sets of meanings have been involved, however, so that the many discussions do not evoke clarity or common understanding.

"Research," for example, has been termed a "function" of the state education agency, a usage which *can* be interpreted by reasonable people at one time or another to mean: (a) to do research is a purpose for which the agency exists; or (b) research is a line of work in which the agency engages; or (c) to use or promote or encourage research is an aim of the agency; or (d) something else. (Disputes regarding the meaning of "research" need not complicate the present discussion, but they also frustrate understanding, of course.)

For purposes of this discussion, "function" is used to denote *a major intended consequence which the state agency seeks to evoke* within the governmental and educational system of its state, pursuant to its efforts to fulfill its three-fold, remote, and unattainable or interminable mission.

"To advise" the legislature, for example, a state education agency––unless it is omniscient––will find it necessary to study educational and related phenomena, hence to utilize the products of pertinent research. It is therefore imperative, if the agency is to pursue that phase of its mission, *that there shall be* research and the products of research. If there is none, the agency cannot be a user or consumer of research, cannot adequately study educational and related phenomena, and cannot properly or honestly or wisely fulfill that phase of its mission which requires it to advise the legislature. If there *is* research and its products, the agency is enabled at least to try.

One major concern of the agency, therefore, and one major intended consequence of its actions is that there shall be research and its products. Research is, in that sense, clearly a state education agency "function."

To evoke the function, the agency may have its own staff perform research. It may urge others to perform research. It may commission or subsidize research. It may subsidize the education or training of people who might later be expected to perform research. The agency may act in all these ways and in others too.

It is incidental what the agency may decide to do in this matter or how it may choose to act on its decision. What is important in this respect is the *function* or *intended consequence* of its decisions and its extensive or limited actions, namely: *that research and its products are available.*

If all the research deemed necessary by the state education agency were being performed and all its products were being made available by other entities, it would be pointless to duplicate the work of others. Hence, in this case, the agency could choose legitimately to "stay out of the research business" entirely: the "function" or intended consequence would require no action by the agency; yet the agency would be enabled to proceed with that part of its own mission which calls upon it––after examining and weighing all pertinent evidence––to advise the principal authorities of state government.

The *function* called "research," if regarded as one major intended consequence of agency performance, may be regarded as one of several mileposts en route to fulfillment of the agency mission. Agency management is challenged to decide what, if anything, the agency must do to evoke the emergence of this intended consequence; and agency performance is tested by whether this intended consequence is realized.

A limited set of seven major functions can be identified, as follows. Each one may be seen primarily as an intended consequence of agency performance. Each *does* require decisions by agency management. Each *may* require one or more types of action by agency staff; as indicated above with respect to research, a variety of actions is plausible in each case. If the decisions are well taken, and if the actions are well executed, these seven functions or desired and intended consequences emerge:

1. ***RESEARCH*** is performed and its products are digested and utilized, to indicate or identify directions for improvement in educational policies, priorities, standards, criteria, and actions.

2. ***INFORMATION AND STATISTICS*** are generated, assembled, and published, to describe and depict education and its characteristics, prospects, and problems, both statewide and in suitable detail by locale, hence to supply further bases for the agency's use in indicating or identifying directions for improvement.

3. ***DISTRIBUTION OF FINANCIAL AND MATERIAL RESOURCES*** is accomplished so that resources are distributed—to and within each educational entity—in amounts and in ways which advance the achievement of stipulated policies and priorities and which make it feasible for the desired conditions to be met within the statewide educational system.

4. ***ADVICE AND ASSISTANCE*** (professional and technical) are provided to the schools, school districts, and other entities, when and if needed to improve instructional and other aspects of educational operations so that the stipulated conditions can be met statewide.

5. ***REGULATION AND LICENSING*** are performed to assure that qualitative and quantitative standards are met or exceeded.

6. ***SPECIAL OPERATIONS AND FACILITIES,*** in attention to matters of statewide concern that merit or require temporary or perennial state conduct, are satisfactorily maintained, whether by state education agency staff, directly under agency supervision, or otherwise.

7. ***INTERNAL MANAGEMENT*** of the state education agency is effectively performed, so that the board, the superintendent, and the staff do constitute a dependable instrument for state government to employ in pursuit of the fulfillment of government's constitutional obligations in matters of education.

It may be noted that these functions or intended consequences do not constitute a list of tasks that invariably must be performed by a state education agency. They are circumstances which must come into being if the agency is to fulfill its basic three-way mission: to advise government, to ascertain whether government's express policies are given effect, and to assure the correction of inadequacies. The enumeration of functions, in other words, does not automatically or inherently define the bulk of the activities in which a state education agency must or should engage, nor does it define the extent or intensity of agency engagement in any given line of activity.

Agency management does, however, automatically inherit the burden––or the opportunity, if management chooses to see it that way––to decide on such questions, hence to control and direct the agency. The seventh major function––internal management of the agency––is not an option which top management is free to exercise or not. It is a prerequisite for other functions, and the onus for it can be borne only by "The Management."

It is entirely possible, of course, that an agency's performance will evoke outcomes or consequences that are entirely unforeseen, or foreseen but unsought. These may emerge in addition to the seven main functions that are sought by the agency's activities, or they may emerge instead of those. Some unintended outcomes may be serendipitous: when discovered to exist, these are perceived to be fortuitous accidents, benign and constructive. Others, however, will be perceived to be as unwelcome, unhappy, and unfortunate as they are unintended, unpredicted, or unexpected. As it acts to control and direct the agency, agency management will wish to capitalize on serendipity, of course, and management will wish equally to cut its losses on any calamity, large or small. Accordingly, agency management must be alert to the emergence of any accidental or unexpected outcomes of agency performance: desirable ones will be added to or incorporated within the basic set of seven functions; undesirable ones will be regarded as "dysfunctions," and their elimination will be sought.

"LEADERSHIP" AND "SERVICE"

The foregoing list of agency functions closely parallels a list which the Council of Chief State School Officers set forth some years ago. The principal difference between the two is this: the CCSSO enumeration has been taken to be a list of "things that a state education agency does"; as interpreted here, it is a list of major desired outcomes or intended consequences of whatever a state education agency may do.

An earlier study, by Fred F. Beach in *The Functions of State Departments of Education* (Washington: Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, 1950), distinguished three classes of functions: regulatory, operational, and leadership. In that formulation also, functions were taken to be the things that an agency does. The "leadership" functions included planning, research, advising or consulting, coordinating, and public relations; the "operational" functions included the provision of services to individuals, the conduct of schools or classes, and the management of cultural and educational institutions or programs of service; and the "regulatory" functions included accreditation, licensing, and certification.

In the CCSSO enumeration, the functions (somewhat abbreviated here) are: general administration of the agency; research and development; provision to others of (a) material and (b) financial support; provision of technical assistance to others, on (a) instructional and (b) administrative matters; and operation of facilities, schools, programs, and services.

Embedded in the two arrays of agency functions––those of the CCSSO and the earlier enumeration by Beach––are two ideas that are widely accepted within state education agencies: (1) the idea that a state education agency is predestined to lead and (2) the idea that a state education agency is dedicated to provide service to schools, districts, and others.

In this monograph, the contrary assumption is made: that neither "leadership" nor "service to local school districts" is foreordained for the state education agency, although the agency very well may come to exercise leadership and might very well choose to render services directly to schools, school boards, and others.

"Leadership" almost inevitably will accrue to a state education agency which performs so well that it is acknowledged to be fulfilling its three-way mission: to advise . . . , to ascertain . . . , and to assure. . . . If an agency offers advice to the state legislature, and if the legislature finds that advice so wise and compelling that it merits adoption, that agency may come to be seen as a "leader." The legislature declares that stipulated policies and priorities are to be followed, and that stipulated conditions are sought statewide within education. If an agency, pursuant to its mission, does in fact ascertain where and to what extent the desired conditions prevail, and if it truly does devise criteria by which to make it feasible to ascertain those facts, that agency may come to be seen as a "leader." If the agency then undertakes to cause deficiencies to be corrected, and if its efforts are successful, that agency will come to be seen as a "leader." It is a leader when it leads, to put it bluntly. Perhaps "leadership" can best be seen as an eighth function––a consequence of the emergence of the other seven.

Leadership, in other words, is not a set of actions or tasks which an education agency performs because it has been ordained to lead. An agency becomes acknowledged as a "leader" within a statewide educational and governmental setting if its performance of its mission––to advise, to ascertain, and to assure––is so efficacious that the seven *desired* outcomes here termed the functions actually emerge as *observable* outcomes or consequences of the agency's efforts. Agency performance, in turn, hinges upon the wisdom and skill and, perhaps, artistry with which agency management controls and directs the courses of action undertaken by the agency.

"Service" is similarly regarded in this essay. The three-fold mission appears to be inherently and automatically prescribed for a state education agency. "To provide service" to entities other than the duly constituted authorities of state government, however, appears to be neither inherent nor automatic. To provide service of a specified variety may constitute an activity engaged in by an agency, of course. It is agency management's obligation and opportunity to cause the agency to engage in whatever set of activities may be required to pursue the agency's mission and to evoke the desired consequences. If it is deemed necessary to provide services to school districts in order "to assure that deficiencies are corrected," for example, agency management obviously may decide to become, in part, a "service" unit. In varying measure, most agencies have chosen to provide service. However, agency management may select a different option.

To illustrate, assume that the state education agency has evidence on which to determine that specific school districts need competent professional and technical assistance—i.e., "service"—on particularly troublesome problems. Stating the matter somewhat differently, the agency concludes—pursuant to the phase of its mission which calls for the correction of deficiencies—that there are some deficiencies that need correcting, and that the proper remedy is competent professional and technical service. The agency's own staff members could be assigned to provide the service, an option which obviously would put the agency directly into the "service business."

Other options are available, however. Agency management might choose to exercise any or all of its options. The agency might prefer to arrange for the technical and professional services to be supplied to recipient school districts, for example, by personnel from other school districts, from community colleges, from public and private colleges and universities, and from private businesses, foundations, or other units of government. This would put the agency not so much into the "service business" as into the "brokerage business."

If the intended consequence (function No. 4 above) is that "advice and assistance are provided when and if needed," agency management may elect a wide range of activities by which to bring about that consequence. The activities chosen may—but not necessarily or automatically—include the direct provision of assistance by agency staff to recipient schools, school districts, and other entities. Instead of seeing itself as a "service" agency, the state education agency may decide to constitute itself as a "support" agency which takes whatever actions may be needed to make certain that appropriate services are provided—somehow, by someone—when and where they are found to be needed.

THE SEVENTH FUNCTION

The choices and options rest with each state education agency's "top management." Which phase of agency mission to emphasize? On which functions to focus how much agency attention and effort? With which agency activities to pursue each function? How to control and direct the agency?

On inspection, the current activities of the existing state education agency may not be congruent with the "mission" and "functions" set forth here. Several reasons for that lack of congruence are easily identified:

1. An agency may have studied "the goals and objectives of education," and may have derived a role for the agency itself from that study. If so, the agency's past "role" or mission and functions may have been defined very differently than they come to be defined when the starting point taken is "state government's constitutional obligations toward education and that government's reasons for having a department of education." For this or other reasons, the agency's past perception of its mission and functions may have differed significantly from the view proposed in these pages. Activities chosen in the past therefore may not match this view.

2. Changes in time and circumstance have led every agency, no doubt, to undertake new activities regularly and progressively. However, prior managements may not have been attentive to the need to cull or weed out obsolete or obsolescent activities of the past even when these have been rendered pointless and unnecessary. For this reason, some ongoing activities may be incongruent with current perceptions of mission.

3. Legislatures and political administrations of the past have assigned specific activities to state education agencies. In an imperfect world, of course, some of these may appear now to have been inappropriate assignments, and some may appear now to be anomalies in the organizational arrangements within state government. For this reason, some ongoing activities may be not congruent with current perceptions of mission.

4. State education agencies seek, obtain, utilize, and administer moneys received from the federal government, which in 1970 provides perhaps 7 percent of the funds for education. Frequently, and perhaps even typically, arrangements for doing so have been made hurriedly, because the federal funds sometimes became available with scant warning. For one reason or another, arrangements for the use of federal funds also may have been separately treated from the outset, then never quite blended into the state education agency's arrangements for regarding the other 93 percent of the funds for education. As a result, some ongoing activities of the agency now may be not congruent with each other, much less with a new perception of agency mission and functions.

Some obviously difficult, persistent, and recurring matters are at issue in the "seventh function"––the internal management of the state education agency. Agency management must decide what its mission is, which phase of agency mission to emphasize, on which functions to focus how much attention and effort, with which activities to pursue each function, and how to control and direct the agency. Agency management must cull the outworn activities which have no contemporary utility, must propose to the legislature and the governor that it be relieved of inappropriate and anomalous assignments, and must make rational, balanced arrangements for the agency's attention to the full 100 percent of the funds––whatever their source––for which it bears a responsibility.

Attention to "the seventh function," accordingly, is at the core of the discussions contained in the remaining chapters of this monograph.

SIGNIFICANCE OF FEDERAL ACTION

The statement that public education is a constitutional obligation of state government, or that education generally is peculiarly a state government's preoccupation, requires some elaboration. The federal government, during relatively recent years, has been increasing its attention to education, and the constitutionality of federal action is not challenged.

The opening statement is supported both by the silence of the U.S. Constitution, which makes no direct reference to education, and by the comparatively clear and forceful references to it which are contained in state constitutions. One state constitution, for example, is explicit that to provide "ample" education for "all" is a "paramount" responsibility of the state. The inference is of long standing that governmental authority over education is among the powers constitutionally reserved to the states. State governments have acted accordingly, regulating and licensing private education, and assuring the existence of public education.

Federal interest, recently increased, is not at all new, however. A national concern for education dates back at least to the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 (thus antedating the Constitution), the Morrill Act of 1862, and creation of the U.S. Office of Education in 1867. Federal activity certainly was stimulated and accelerated by Sputnik's appearance in 1957, but it was not initiated thereby.

Financial and Policy Supplements

Actions of the federal government are of two separable types: they supply financial resources which are to be utilized in education; and they stipulate national policies which are to be observed in the conduct of education. The moneys thus supplied are highly useful to the states. The more interesting question, however, is that of the significance which national policies enunciated by the federal government have for the activities of state government in the field of education.

National policies established by acts of Congress and endorsed by the President become, pursuant to the Constitution, parts of "the supreme law of the land." They are binding upon each state, just as they are upon each citizen. Therefore the national policies thus established have to be incorporated into or encompassed by the policies of each state government. They establish conditions which each state is constrained to observe as it establishes its own policies, priorities, standards, criteria, and institutional arrangements for the conduct or regulation of government.

National policy enunciated by the federal government, however, does not say that the obligation to govern or assure the existence of education now is transferred from the shoulders of state governments to those of the federal government. To the contrary, federal law and regulation serve to reiterate explicitly the traditional reliance upon state and local authorities for the conduct of education.

A basic conclusion may be drawn, therefore, regarding the significance of new and increased federal interest and participation: national policies do not appear to reduce each state's constitutional obligations for education. Federal law and national policy "supplement but do not supplant" state policies for education, just as federal moneys explicitly are intended by the Congress to supplement but not to supplant state and local funds for education. The laws enacted by Congress cannot be construed to erase each state's prior obligations. Hence they appear not to alter what hitherto had been taken to be fact: that the assurance of "ample education for all" truly is among the "paramount" responsibilities or commitments of the government in each state of the Union.

Actions of the federal government have further significance, however. For many years, federal action could be interpreted as constituting simply "federal aid to education." Relatively small in amount, funds supplied could be interpreted symbolically as tokens of the federal government's high esteem for education and its wish to encourage aspects of educational effort. Even now in 1971, when the federal share of funds for education is some 7 or 8 percent of the total nationwide expenditure, that share clearly is substantial and significant but still is clearly a minority share. And, inasmuch as it supplements but does not supplant state and local investments, it still can be regarded as "federal aid" for education.

Educational and Social Reform

That is not all the federal laws and actions are, however. The funds are made available pursuant to provisions of substantive, policy-laden laws. The legislation can be construed to be aimed at "The Reform of U.S. Education," in fact, and also at some aspects of "Social Reform in the United States." This is a second basic conclusion that must be drawn, therefore, regarding the significance of the new and increased federal interest and participation in matters of education: the federal government has not undertaken to "supplant" the states in their relationships to education, but the federal government is by no means simply increasing its financial contributions; to the contrary, it is enunciating national policies.

Federal legislation, in addition to authorizing funds, does these things: it specifies that the funds are to be utilized to effect changes in education; to conduct varieties of educational activities which had not been conducted hitherto or had been conducted in few places; to augment organized education's attention to activities or clients which, in the judgment of Congress, have received insufficient attention heretofore; and, possibly, to discontinue some behaviors of the established educational systems which, in the judgment of Congress, constitute bad public policy.

The federal laws and federal funds clearly appear to be intended to produce significant changes within education—–changes in emphasis, substance, method, place, and purpose. Taken together, these changes readily can be interpreted to call for "reform" in education. They contain more than merely a suggestion that the federal government and the people it represents are less than entirely gratified or satisfied by the past performance of U.S. education or, perforce, by past performance of state and local jurisdictions which provide for education and its governance.

Furthermore, the federal enactments regarding education have to be considered together with other recent federal legislation on other social matters. Federal laws contain efforts to make adjustments in the social machinery of education. They contain parallel efforts regarding housing, employment, health, and transportation, and they call for adjustments in the existing social machinery for sectors of society other than education. If all such laws are regarded as a set, it may be seen that they are linked by some common characteristics, and they may be construed to fit under a general heading of "social justice," "war on poverty," "equal opportunity under the law," or a similar label. It takes no stretch of the imagination to interpret such laws as being intended to bring about not only "educational reform" but also "social reform in the United States."

It seems sufficiently obvious, therefore, that federal legislation and federal action have significance for state governments and for their executive departments of education, as well as for their local school districts and institutions or other educational entities. The significance extends well beyond the part which each state government and state education agency may play in the transmission, custody, and disposition of federal moneys, even though playing this part will continue to complicate the fiscal, fiduciary, or fidelity aspects of educational endeavors. The greater significance appears to lie in the substantial changes which federal legislation calls for in the conduct of education and in the connections between organized education and other segments of social machinery in the United States.

The social machinery termed "the statewide educational system" continues to operate under the aegis of each state government. The machinery is not entirely either self-regulating or self-adjusting. Schools, school districts, and other parts of the machinery may improve through time, but they may deteriorate in some respects. Furthermore, as social conditions change, judgments may have to be revised regarding the adequacy and appropriateness of parts of the machinery and the rates, methods, and extent of coverage in the operations of those parts.

Large and small adjustments in policies, priorities, standards, and criteria may necessitate corresponding adjustments in institutions, methods of operation, outcomes sought, patterns of expenditure, and allocations of duties, responsibilities, and authority among the component parts of the statewide educational system. Federal legislation has established national policies, for instance, and these may necessitate various adjustments. But the federal legislation does not seem to alter the fact that state government remains as fully in charge of its statewide arrangements for education as it ever has been.

Under the aegis of state government, educational responsibilities and authority are widely dispersed. State government retains the right and the obligation to hold each component of the statewide system accountable for the fulfillment of its responsibilities and the exercise of its authority. It can do so with respect to the fiduciary or fidelity aspects of the transmission, custody, and disposition of funds within education. It also can do so with respect to the general headings being taken by educational institutions or school systems, and with respect to their management, their performance, and the extent of their achievements, accomplishments, or productivity. A state education agency, as state government's executive department of education, is a major instrument which state government can utilize to exercise its right and obligation in these several respects, as indicated in the foregoing enumeration of the agency's mission and functions.

A Test of State Adaptability

The significance of federal actions and legislation of recent years is substantial, but it leaves the social machinery of education essentially intact, with the basic obligations still to be carried on state government shoulders. The federal activity makes more funds available for educational uses, and it creates a new urgency for correcting those educational arrangements which no longer are satisfactory. Implicitly, it also sets up a test of each state government and its state education agency. And it is not far-fetched to see it as a test of the federal system of government in the United States: the adaptability of the federal system to contemporary needs and conditions may be measured in part by the performance of the states and their education agencies in adapting local, state, and federal participation to assure the provision of "ample" education for "all." The federal legislation suggests strongly that the existing social machinery for education has been examined, that its concept, conduct, and performance have been found wanting, and that changes are required in it as a matter of national policy. The question pending is whether the states are up to the task of bringing about the changes.

In this monograph, attention is centered upon the state education agency because that executive department's performance is crucial to state government's response to the test. More particularly, attention is centered on the state education agency's internal management, because that function—–the intended outcome that agency management be adeptly and effectively performed—–is a prerequisite for intelligent and effective agency action elsewhere within the statewide educational system.

III.

A System of Management Processes

Management must deal with people, things, ideas, and money; must––especially––deal with the relationships among them; and must do so with consideration for cultural, educational, financial, economic, social, and political problems. Management must––within the limits of human capability––see these as an integrated whole, i.e., as a "system," and also be able to differentiate them. And management must satisfy these requirements continuously and repeatedly with no possibility of declaring a moratorium to permit further study. An agency has a mission and a set of major intended consequences or functions. The agency's management must control and direct the agency, orienting it to the fulfillment of that mission, and bringing about those functions.

The policies and activities of state government and of education are conceived, authorized, scheduled, and executed constantly, as problems arise and subside, in endless major and minor cycles. In a simplified way, each cycle may be said to include these phases:

> A difficulty is encountered; an undesirable situation is noted; a new need is identified; or a new opportunity emerges.
>
> Formally or not, the matter is studied.

> Formally or not, a "solution" is found or invented and adopted.
>
> The solution is put into effect by making a decision or by adopting a policy, perhaps by launching a course of action and activity.
>
> Results are observed and—–tacitly or otherwise—–appraised or evaluated, as a basis for choosing whether to start another cycle.

Thus described, the ingredients are few: recognition; study; choice of solution; execution; evaluation. Whole hosts of matters are attended to adequately and almost automatically by competent professionals who run swiftly through the cycle and resolve the matter at hand.

Major difficulties, needs, opportunities, and problems are another matter. Particularly if they involve situations that are undesirable and compelling, rather than merely awkward, such matters receive more elaborate treatment. The cycle of events is less simple. And the events require attention by top management rather than by the professional who happens to be nearest at hand.

Management uses a series of processes—–regularized and institutionalized processes—–for deciding where to direct its efforts and the efforts of the enterprise. These are constituent processes—–e.g., planning, controlling, evaluating—–common to management of any enterprise, using any managerial style or system. They may be instrumented in various ways, using various configurations of procedures, resources, and human efforts. Management relies upon the processes, but management personnel themselves do not necessarily activate the processes. Responsibility, authority, and accountability are parceled out by skillful managers. The processes are activated throughout the enterprise. They are made effective and useful to the extent that there is artistry in management's deployment of responsibility and authority and in management's provisions for assuring accountability.

Management processes are essential components of management's performance. Efforts to improve overall management invariably rely on methods to strengthen one or more management processes. In the remainder of this monograph, major attention is drawn to the processes and to means for making them stronger and more useful, individually and collectively, to management in state education agencies.

THE PROCESSES

There are various ways to formulate statements of the set or system of interrelated processes. The venerable acronym POSDCORB (for Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting, and Budgeting) represents one formulation. What follows also is one plausible enumeration and description. The processes are not entirely discrete, and all processes are operative continuously and concurrently. Therefore each process influences all the others. Activated deliberately, consciously, and purposefully, they together constitute the "stuff" of management. In the "real world of management," they perhaps are not separable. For purposes of this monograph, however, the processes are the following twelve:

Anticipating Futures
Planning
Programming
Organizing
Staffing
Financing
Budgeting
Administering
Controlling
Relationship Building
Evaluating
Institutional Development

This section is intended to describe the processes and relationships among them. They help management attend to internal and external matters of the enterprise: internally, to mold the agency into a smoothly functioning instrument capable of accomplishing its goals; externally, to identify major needs, problems, and opportunities in the state's educational system, and to improve the delivery of appropriate public services. Management must identify needs and resources; identify long-range goals and intermediate targets or objectives; develop criteria or standards by which to stimulate and to measure progress; cause the agency to conduct purposive activities; and accomplish these steps with the limited resources available. *Management* and management processes accomplish these intermediate ends. Agency *performance* of chosen activities presumably accomplishes other ends.

To explain the processes and to emphasize some connections among them, the following simulated case may be illuminating: it starts from the adoption by the U.S. Congress of legislation providing federal funds to state education agencies for the purpose of instituting or improving their planning capabilities. The case illustrates the fact that there is no fixed sequential order to the processes. The order in which the processes are activated depends on the situation at hand. Two or more processes will often be carried on simultaneously. A separate discussion of each process will follow.

An Illustrative Case

The chief state school officer of the SEA[4] in State A on a sunny Monday morning in mid-May receives a phone call from Mr. Smith, a member of the staff of one of the U.S. Senators from the state. Mr. Smith informs the CSSO that the Senate has just approved legislation earlier adopted by the House which provides federal funds to SEAs for instituting or improving their capabilities for educational planning. According to Mr. Smith, the President is sure to approve the legislation, and the CSSO can expect to receive up to $75,000 in new federal funds for

[4] *The following abbreviations are utilized occasionally in this paper; SEA for state education agency; USOE for U. S. Office of Education; CCSO for Chief State School Officer.*

the fiscal year beginning July 1, provided the SEA is on its toes and fulfills at the earliest possible moment the conditions set forth in the legislation for obtaining funds from the U.S. Office of Education. Mr. Smith states that he will forward copies of the legislation. He will also do what he can to speed Office of Education guidelines, application forms, and other materials to the CSSO. This is an example of *relationship building* on the part of the CSSO and the SEA. (Of course, it is also relationship building on the part of the Senator and his staff.) The CSSO is benefiting from having established and maintained constructive relationships with the Senator and his staff. Presumably, he has indicated how the Senator's Office might be helpful to the SEA and has succeeded in convincing that Office to provide such assistance.

Following his conversation with Mr. Smith, the CSSO takes some time to think about what course of action he should adopt in relation to this windfall. He is engaged in informally *planning* his next steps. He decides to begin by notifying other members of the SEA's management team and scheduling a meeting with them to discuss the subject.

The meeting begins with a summary of the present condition of planning in the SEA. Statements are made by the individuals responsible for SEA evaluation and for development activities which are internally focused––that is: activities concerned with determining how effectively the SEA is accomplishing its objectives; and activities directed at identifying inadequacies in present agency operations, finding ways of improving operations, and introducing, testing, and improving new developments for adoption by the agency.

In the summary, reference is made to the fact that the agency does not have a separate planning unit or staff. Broad, general planning has been viewed as one of the major responsibilities of the SEA top management. More specific, detailed planning has been treated as an integral aspect of budgeting and of operating the agency's several divisions. However, several months ago in the course of *evaluating* agency operations, there were indications that these arrangements for planning were thoroughly unsatisfactory. Therefore, an *institutional development* project was initiated to analyze alternate approaches to planning. One result of the study was a proposal for developing and installing a new planning process, and a general outline of a recommended process has been developed. The CSSO concludes the summary by expressing his belief that the outlined process can be readily modified to qualify for the new federal funds.

Near the end of the meeting, the CSSO assigns to his deputy the responsibility for directing SEA participation in the federal funding opportunity. The CSSO's activities to this point illustrate the day-to-day decision making, scheduling, supervising, and coordinating of work that constitutes *administering*.

After receiving and reviewing the federal legislation and related USOE materials, the deputy considers several questions. Does this federal interest in planning and do related federal concerns offer clues to probable further developments? How will the SEA operate with a separate planning capability? How will SEA planning affect other SEA activities? How will SEA planning relate to the planning activities of the state government? The consideration of such questions is an attempt to *anticipate futures* and future contingencies.

Next the deputy prepares a step-by-step set of decisions for action in the future necessary to utilize the new federal funds in ways which will best assist the agency to realize its objectives. He is *planning* for *planning*. Part of this step includes identifying the agency activities that will be required to carry out the plan. This is *programming*.

One condition for receiving the federal funds is that the state provide some matching funds. Fortunately, the state legislature is in session. The deputy prepares a supplementary request for funds, the CSSO delivers it to the legislature, and they "bird-dog" it through the legislative process until an appropriations measure is enacted. All of these efforts are part of the *financing* process.

Even before federal and state funds are assured, the deputy turns to the question of the specific activities the funds will support during the forthcoming fiscal year. In some detail, he specifies what is to be done, why it is to be done, the resources required to do it, and the sources from which the necessary resources will come. *Budgeting* for the new set of activities has been accomplished.

Planning, it is decided, is to be a separate unit of the organization. The deputy develops recommendations for the decision of the CSSO on items such as: (1) to whom the unit head will report, (2) what responsibility and authority relations will exist between the planning unit and other organizational units, and (3) what subunits, if any, should exist in the planning unit. These arrangements are matters of *organizing*.

Staffing is a closely related process. A determination must be made of the number and kind of positions to be assigned to the planning unit. Persons with appropriate training and experience must be found to fill the positions.

Once the planning unit begins operations, there will have to be means of ascertaining that activities are performed as planned, programmed, and budgeted. In other words, there need to be means of *controlling* activities to enable unit personnel and agency management to determine whether operations are effective.

All twelve processes have been touched on in this illustrative case. While the example refers to a new program in an SEA, hopefully it is clear that all processes are continuously in use in some way as part of the day-to-day management of the agency.

THE ONGOING ENTERPRISE

In the existing enterprise, of course, each process is under way. They are not activated in sequence, but are all in constant use. If things go awry, it is not feasible to declare a moratorium or to begin again. Adjustments must be made while the enterprise remains in motion. For example, while this year's budget is being executed––i.e., while this year's plan of operations is being administered, controlled, evaluated, etc.––next year's work plan (and perhaps the following one as well) is being constructed and financed, or (following gubernatorial, legislative, and USOE actions) it is being reconstructed. The chief state school officer and others, meanwhile, are trying to anticipate possible futures. The agency is building plans––including contingency plans, adapted to one future or another––and programming activities. Staff is being hired, fired, retired, replaced, reassigned, trained, schooled, sent off to do further study, and otherwise developed. Many aspects of the organizational structure, staffing pattern, and operations are being measured, evaluated, and remodeled––pursuant to results of institutional development and subject to various management controls.

Time and timing both are significant to the various processes. Quite a long time frame is contemplated when agency management attempts to anticipate the future. Plans are drawn with reference to several years ahead. Programming relates to activities that may continue for extended time. Budgeting tends to concentrate on the future in one-year time segments. Staffing may have to be viewed in career-long segments. Institutional development is oriented to a future, and so is evaluating. Of the dozen processes, only controlling and administering tend to emphasize the present.

TIERS OF MANAGEMENT

At central headquarters of state government, the governor and others comprise the state's "top management." They activate and utilize management processes.

At central headquarters of each major department or agency of state government, each agency has its own "top management." In the state education agency, the chief and other major officers, as the agency's top management, activate and utilize management processes in much the way that the governor and his aides do. The same is true for top management of each school system, university, college, and other entity within the statewide educational system.

Elsewhere within the state education agency, bureau chiefs, division heads, and directors of institutions and projects also have managerial responsibilities. They too activate and utilize such processes.

As noted earlier, the entire system contains endless cycles which accomplish the recognition, study, treatment, and resolution of problems. Something of "the stuff of management" is built into human treatment of any problem. For many of the "lesser cycles," competent persons race through the cycle and resolve the matter without further ado. Individual staff members, for example, set targets, schedule activities, budget time, exercise controls, evaluate results, and so forth.

Management processes, in short, are not a concern exclusively of top management. They must be activated in ways which serve several tiers of managerial concerns within each enterprise of the statewide governmental and educational structure.

PROCESSES VIEWED SINGLY

The dozen processes have been introduced as a set which management must activate individually and in combination. They now are examined singly, even though it is artificial to divide them. The following statements are not in rank order to indicate relative importance, sequence, priority, or difficulty. They are stated affirmatively, with the implication that "good" management will activate these processes consciously, deliberately, and purposefully. It may be noted, however, that the processes are operative in any organized enterprise, whether or not management is "good" or is conscious of them as processes.

Anticipating Futures. This process does not consist just of projecting current trends, nor does it suggest that management must predict the future. It is a part of human effort to control future events, and not merely to respond to them. It requires management to anticipate what the future *might* be, as a basis both for guiding events and for dealing with them, and to anticipate what that might mean for the agency's mission and functions.

The process is to anticipate varied futures and to depict perhaps a half-dozen different versions of what education might be like a few decades ahead. Among them, these speculative depictions of futures are likely to include many characteristics of the actual future. Some elements depicted may be common to all of the futures, hence may be really solid bases for planning.

If future educational needs and opportunities can be anticipated and if the direction of events can be influenced by what a state education agency may do, this process certainly provides ample basis for contingency planning. Management can anticipate alternative kinds of educational institutions, actions, developments, resources, and policies––those needed now to begin to move education in a desired direction, and those that may be needed a few years hence. Obviously, these considerations have a bearing on the nature, not only of future public services to be delivered, but also of the future state education agency as a vehicle for delivery. Perhaps both the services and the vehicle must change markedly.

"To anticipate futures" does not equal "to draw definitive plans for future action," but it is an essential prior step. It may be treated as a matter of research or of research interpretation; that is, the state education agency may perform this process directly or rely on outside organizations to do it. Either way, anticipating the futures (sometimes called "future planning") is one process that agency management must be sure to activate.

Planning. This process relies heavily on collection and analysis of information and ideas. However, planning is not definable as research or statistical study. To plan is to define goals and objectives that are congruent with agency mission, and to design the policies and actions deemed most likely to guide agency efforts toward stated goals and objectives. If "goals" are defined as long-range, general in content, broad in scope, and directed at ultimate ends, then "objectives" may be defined as relatively short-range, specific, narrow, and directed at intermediate ends. Planning is addressed to both goals and objectives. Objectives may be considered intermediate steps that the agency must accomplish before its goal can be attained.

Planning to meet specific objectives establishes what an organization must do, now and in the near future, to accomplish its goals. Most management processes are keyed to specific plans developed to accomplish stated objectives. Planning––when integrated with the other management processes––assures that decisions required in day-to-day administration are made as the logical result of a comprehensive design.

Planning and programming are so closely connected that to discuss them separately is really arbitrary. Managers, in fact, probably discuss objectives and conceive of related activities at once. The distinction between the two processes has a certain utility, however. In this discussion, planning relates most directly to the selection of objectives, and programming to the choice of activities calculated to reach objectives.

Programming. This process consists of conceiving, designing, and choosing among work activities that are deemed to be plausible and feasible means for the agency to achieve one or more objectives. To plan is to select objectives; to program is to select the work or the activities that will be used in pursuing and accomplishing objectives. To translate objectives (what we want to happen) into programmed activities (what we'll do to try to bring it about) is one of the most crucial steps for management.

When agency activities are carried out, assessments are made (a) of the amounts of work accomplished and resources consumed and (b) of the effects achieved on the stipulated objectives. Evaluations then lead to further and presumably more enlightened planning, programming, and actual conduct of activities.

Organizing. This is the process of selecting, building, and reshaping the institutional structure to make it most appropriate (a) for the conduct of agency activities and (b) for deriving maximum advantage from staff talents and predispositions. Obviously, the prime consideration is that the organizational structure shall facilitate the agency's performance of the instrumental tasks that the agency selects or state government assigns to it. To organize is to define the general duties and specialized tasks of individual employees, to establish the broad outlines of their interrelationships, and to determine lines of authority, responsibility, and accountability.

Since work may be divided in many different ways, the effectiveness of the enterprise depends partly upon the skill with which the work is divided. One ostensibly logical way to organize, for example, is by function. Another is to cause the organizational structure to parallel "the program structure."[5] An organization structure certainly cannot be incompatible with either the functions or the program structure and still be useful. Various considerations suggest other "organizing principles" that are also logical and compelling. Therefore, organizational structures may respond partly to questions of program, geography, clientele, function, politics, and administrative preferences or convenience. "Best" ways to organize remain unidentified.

Staffing. This process centers about the determination of the agency's personnel requirements, plus recruitment, selection, and staff development. It also involves tailoring positions to maximize the usefulness of individual talents; matching individual preferences with institutional requirements; systems of rewards and satisfactions; and other aspects of personnel administration. As objectives are determined, activities designed, and organizational structure established, the basis is developed for selection and optimum assignment of personnel.

---

[5] *This anticipates later discussion. Briefly, a "program structure is any orderly enumeration of all activities of the agency, in which activities are grouped into a relatively small set of basic "programs."*

If management does not activate the staffing process well enough to yield the right kind of personnel, the agency is doomed to mediocrity or failure. Activating the process may call for classifying the positions in the agency, determining the education and experience required in each classification, and developing salary guides. Such steps help both to measure personnel needs and to provide the information necessary to recruit and place new personnel. A staff development effort should orient new personnel and enable all personnel to acquire new methods and concepts.

State education agencies now tend to fill virtually all professional and managerial positions with persons "raised" from the ranks of teachers and school administrators; degrees in education, certificates, and years of school experience presumably are believed to qualify them. The question may be raised, wherever this is the case, whether agency management has allowed "credentialism" to serve in lieu of a staffing process. It may be logical to prefer "education" backgrounds. For a high percentage of positions, however, such background probably is not the critical requirement, and in numerous positions a different background would be desirable. The "knowledge industry" (of which the agency is a part) rather clearly relies on talents other than those of the "educationist," and so does the industry of state government, of which the agency also is a part. For example, if the agency needs the knowledge and skills of various disciplines (e.g., economics, sociology, or linguistics) and professions (e.g., public administration, engineering, medicine, law, social work, or accounting), it must recruit outside a narrowly defined field of "education" and it must provide for "lateral entry" from other fields.

Financing. Closely related to budgeting is the process of acquiring the resources needed to support the agency in its mission-oriented activities. Budgeting is used to determine resource needs and to direct the allocation of resources at hand; financing is used to find where resources may be sought and how they are to be obtained, or "how we will support what we plan, program, and budget."

State education agencies exist to provide or to assure the provision of public services, and the public pays taxes for services delivered. The public pays taxes for many kinds of services, however, and state legislatures appropriate tax funds to numerous agencies and institutions. State education agencies compete with all those other enterprises, and the total resources available never are unlimited.

The more successful an agency is in delivering needed services, in justifying its resource needs, in being aware of funding opportunities, and in maintaining constructive relationships with pertinent groups and organizations, obviously, the easier it becomes for the agency to obtain resources and the more feasible it becomes for the agency to deliver appropriate services in fulfillment of its mission. Good performance facilitates financing, of course; reciprocally, effective financing makes performance possible.

Budgeting. This is the process of defining the work plan to be followed during a specific period of time, with the use of specified resources. In effect, it is detailed planning and programming. It therefore is focused on the requirements of each goal-directed activity that has been programmed. In budgeting, management relates activities to dollars of planned expenditures. Budgeting is a year-round, multiphased, and cyclic process. In the process, resource needs are compiled and requested for the conduct of all programmed activities; actual resources, when they become available, are allocated; and some bases are established for management to exercise controls.

One product of budgeting is a budget document which expresses the work plan finally adopted: what is to be done, to what end, by which organizational units, at what costs, with financial resources drawn from what sources. The work plan expresses the agency's total "program," and a budget therefore is "program-oriented." Program-oriented means that the budget is related directly to substantive matters of the agency: purpose as expressed in goals and objectives and the substance of the work as expressed in activities aimed at those objectives.

Fundamentally, budgeting draws attention to the means of attaining objectives, the means being activities and resource requirements. Budgeting also relates these to organizational arrangements, staffing patterns, revenue sources, objects of expenditure, and other essentially structural or financial characteristics. One expression of the budget when recorded in agency financial accounts, provides a basis for financial controls. If the budget is program-oriented, it also provides a basis for other and more substantive controls, e.g., for evaluation and control related to work measurement and to accomplishment.

Administering. "Management" and "administration" are variously defined, often as synonyms. When they are differentiated, some writers choose to have "administration" encompass or outrank "management" whereas others reverse the order, as is the case here. "Administering" is used here to encompass as one component management process all the day-to-day decision making, scheduling, supervising, and coordinating of the agency's work. It is not sufficient for a legislative body or a management group to establish objectives, choose activities, and outline programs and in those ways to decide where the agency is going and how it is going to get there. No matter how skillful the design, many internal and external factors create a constant need for adjustments in agency operations. These adjustments require decisions to be made, supervision to be exercised, and work to be coordinated by management.

Administering is a useful name for the process by which management keeps the enterprise headed toward its objectives, not blindly, but with as little deviation from its planned course as circumstances permit to prudent and thoughtful humans; it is a matter of situational tactic, not of strategy.

Controlling. This is the process of ascertaining that activities are performed as planned and in accordance with policies. Control, a continuous responsibility of management, implies an audit—–substantive as well as procedural and fiscal—–of all operations. The process depends upon an adequate flow of well-ordered information. Its most common medium is a system of communications and of internal reports—–daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, and annually—–which keep management and others informed of the agency's total operation and segments thereof.

Controlling is a positive process, not a negative one. It is not so much a means for management to maintain power over the activities of hierarchical subordinates, as it is a means to enable personnel at various points to determine that each part of the enterprise maintains effective operations. Successful management evokes the enthusiasm and initiative of the full staff, hence management does not control in ways which will defeat that purpose by inhibiting the staff.

Controlling and evaluating are closely related, and together they generate much of what has been termed administering. Controls are used to make certain that things go as planned. Evaluations and substantive audits question not only whether things are going as planned, but also whether conformance to plan is a good thing. Fidelity audits—–concentrated on fiscal or fiduciary matters—–question whether the transmission, custody, and disposition of funds are carried out with honesty and integrity. Administering mediates and modifies, accomplishing a host of adjustments to prevent controls from binding unduly and to protect plans from being pursued blindly.

Relationship Building. This is the process of establishing and maintaining good relationships with the several major internal and external publics with which the agency and its management must deal. For example, the processes of staffing, organizing, administering, and controlling serve partly to provide the relationship-building that must go on internally. Externally, an agency has contacts and relationships with many organizations, groups, and individuals: the legislature; the governor; other governmental agencies, federal, state, and local; and the general public

It is critical that an enterprise maintain good relationships, and most governmental agencies try very hard to establish them. The burden of relationship-building rests essentially upon management. Basically, it is neither avoidable nor delegable.

Agency relationships with local school authorities and federal units clearly are important. It is not quite so obvious that proper conduct of agency relations with other "noneducational" units of state government also may be critical. A few examples may suffice to make the point.

Educational planning, to cite one example, impinges upon and is affected by other aspects of state planning; e.g., for industrial development, for "manpower," for interlocking services in areas of health, welfare, employment, rehabilitation, training, or child care. Agency management must make certain that those other aspects do not receive undue emphasis, insofar as essentially educational matters are concerned; hence, agency management must become appropriately well placed among those who govern state planning activities.

Similarly, agency budgeting, accounting, employment, and data processing capabilities may be subject to the rule-making and service- or support-rendering potential of other units of government. A state education agency could become sterile if cut off from adequate computer facilities; if regulated out of the personnel market; if unable to keep books in ways that satisfy all information requirements of planning, programming, budgeting, evaluating, and other processes. Agency management, accordingly, is constrained to relate to other units of government in ways which will cause them to support rather than hinder agency activity.

Evaluating. This is the process whereby management determines the effectiveness and usefulness of the agency's behavior, i.e., the activities, resource allocations, methodologies, *et al.*, used to pursue agency objectives. It is a way to capture and make use of "feedback." Feedback is read and interpreted, and management responds by modifying the agency's behavior to make agency activities more productive of desired results.

Measurement (quantitative) and evaluation (qualitative) are interrelated. Some measurements indicate the directions, costs, and amounts of work: how much of each programmed activity is the agency performing? Taken over time, these measurements can be used as a guide for changes in work load. Measurement also yields information about outcomes of work: how effectively are the agency's activities bringing about the desired results?

The agency is mission-oriented and goal-oriented; all its work presumably is purposive. To measure the work performed without evaluating its outcomes would be pointless. To assess the outcomes without measuring the quantity and costs of the work would be equally so. Evaluating should be used to make necessary corrections in all of the other management processes.

Institutional Development. Reference here is not to the agency's function of educational research and scholarship. The reference is limited to conducting, sponsoring, or otherwise stimulating management analyses of the state education agency itself: i.e., studies to identify needs for improvement in the agency, to develop means for improvement, and to introduce, test, and improve new developments before they go into regular use within the enterprise. The object is to make the state education agency a progressively more useful vehicle for the state's delivery of public services. Institutional studies are performed systematically to collect and analyze facts and ideas about the agency, to find usable solutions to the agency's current or anticipated operating problems, and to incorporate what is learned into the agency's ongoing operations. With help from such studies, management determines what new activities the agency should adopt, ways to implement these, and changes that need to be made in existing arrangements.

Again, note the distinction: "institutional development" is a management process, oriented to improvement of the agency as a vehicle for delivering services; it is directed inward. "Educational research and research interpretation," on the other hand, is a basic outward-directed function of the agency; i.e., it is one of the primary intended outcomes or consequences that the agency is in business to evoke or to deliver. Institutional development is of interest almost exclusively to agency management and agency operating personnel. Educational research––performed, stimulated, or interpreted by agency staff––is of interest to the entire educational system, to other units of state and local government, and to the general public.

IV.

Conditions and Trends in Public Management

In this chapter, attention turns toward the study of management or of public administration, toward recent trends in management, and toward "systems" approaches to the study and resolution of problems. The discussion yields a "systems view" of the state education agency and its management, together with a redefinition of management consistent with that view.

The systems view should serve to clarify further the purposes and utility of the management processes and of their relationship to the agency's mission and functions. The final chapter, accordingly, will return to how and why management may instrument and utilize the processes in pursuit of improved agency operations and performance.

TRENDS IN MANAGEMENT

The study and practice of management (or of administration——the terms are interchangeable in this context) have proceeded for a long while, with wave after wave of new magic formulas being advanced, tested, shattered, and absorbed. At least three conclusions are indisputable. First, there surely is such a thing as management, whether it is art, science, or craft:

if not, how could the sphinx, or China's great wall, or Napoleon's armies, or Genghis Khan's hordes have been developed? Second, management existed long before the Apollo missions, "the systems approach," the PERT or critical path charting techniques, and PPB systems. Third, management is a terribly complex matter.

Management has been at work ever since men initiated purposive and collaborative effort. Whatever management or administration consists of, it clearly is present in every purposive and collaborative effort, regardless of time, place, problem area, or other circumstance.

Indeed, Henri Fayol, one of the earliest of modern writers on the subject, held that administration is present in every human activity. Thus, between a housewife's management role and a chief state school officer's––the difference is merely one of degree: the housewife presumably spends more time and effort in "doing" than in planning to do, or in otherwise administering; proportionately, the Chief presumably invests much more heavily in administration.

Administration, as a field of study, has grown rapidly during the past sixty or seventy years. Unfortunately, advance has been spasmodic, marked by periodic surges of new styles that are oversold and, as fads do, fade away. Each new style leaves a residue of value, however.

Uplift, Reform, and "Science"

In the United States, it has been held from time to time that anyone could satisfactorily perform any public task, but that Jacksonian notion appears to have been overcome in the course of efforts to professionalize and uplift the public service. Reform movements, the "muckrakers," advocates of merit systems, opponents of the patronage system, champions of honest government, protectors of the public treasury––each group or movement has caused some new development to be rather widely adopted. The development is "squeezed dry" and the residue is incorporated into contemporary ideas about management of public enterprises. For example, efforts to professionalize and uplift public service may have been carried too far in some respects, and employment standards may have been made unreasonably stringent with the awkward result that some citizens are made "unemployable" artifically; corrective action is now underway. It is predictable that the same will be the case with PPB systems, charting methods, a reemphasis of accountability, and other more recent enthusiasms.

Both in and out of government, various perceptions of the problem have been advanced. Hence, there has been––from time to time––an excessive or exaggerated emphasis on scientific management, time and motion studies, work measurement, human relations, environmental conditions, systems of reward, planning, evaluation, organizational theory, or budgeting, or on operations research, computers, information systems, or other interesting and useful ideas, techniques, and approaches. Again, each of these leaves at least a residue that is incorporated into contemporary thought and practice.

The problem evidently is complex. It also is significant to human endeavor. It both requires and merits serious thought and effort by the best minds available. That being so, it should come as no surprise that––just as there is no royal road to learning––there is no quick and easy formula for effective management. Each approach that has been advanced as quick and easy has turned out to be only a "gimmick," a possibly useful and provocative novelty which does not resolve management problems.

The Systems Approach

Contemporary attention to the study of management takes what is termed "the systems approach": more precisely, systems *approaches,* for the subject remains very fluid. Such approaches represent efforts: (a) to see an enterprise as an integrated whole; (b) simultaneously to see, recognize, identify, and order its many differentiated component parts, their properties, the processes that activate the parts, relationships among these, and outcomes of their interactions; and (c) through time, to observe, initiate, accelerate, and guide change in the system.

A systems approach acknowledges the complexity of complex phenomena, but attempts to bring order and understanding out of confusion; that is a useful starting point. From that approach, one undertakes to study a given set of complex phenomena as a single unified system; boundaries mark the system off from neighboring systems, but they do not isolate it; and attention to change is a central theme.

Given this sort of approach, "a system" may be virtually anything, of course. Depending upon the academic discipline in which one explores the matter, systems indeed are many different things; e.g., economic systems, political systems, social systems, and so forth. Because the approach encourages acknowledgement of many differentiations, however, it appears to foster considerable interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary thought and effort that is advantageous.

For example, the anthropological concept of a culture is one type of system that is an abstraction from reality. A description of a culture depicts a system of patterns of behavior observed within one group of people, but not within another. Attention is drawn to relationships among the patterns and to repercussions which changes in one pattern may have upon others within a single system. The sociological concept of a social system treats interactions among members of groups. "Group" may mean society as a whole, the family, the community, an enterprise, a club, or any other cluster which, for purposes of analysis, may be marked off as a unified system. Again, attention is drawn to interactions and relationships, and to change and the concomitants of change.

In each systems approach or systems view of complex phenomena, the objectives are to find ways to describe, to explain, to predict, and perhaps to control and direct changes in the phenomena. Efforts to date are promising, but far from definitive. Even so, systems approaches have merit. At the very least, they have face validity. They acknowledge both the complexity and the constant changeability of relationships among discrete units (whether the units are termed parts, entities, processes, etc.). They yield depictions that correspond to observable reality. Whether available systems will yield reliable guides to decisions, action, or treatment, however remains a moot point at the present stage of development. Nevertheless, systems approaches are inherently so complex that they seem unlikely to become mere gimmicks, even though a certain amount of "gimmickry" is being generated around them, e.g., in some of the more enthusiastic zealotry that surrounds ideas of the "magic" to be worked with computers, information systems, "PPBS" (discussed later), and other useful but difficult devices available.

Emphasis on Results

For decades, the literature of public administration has defined a budget as a plan of operations that is expressed partly in financial terms. For a state education agency or for any other mission-oriented, goal-oriented enterprise, a budget presumably indicated the "why, how, and how much" of its planned activity. Far from being merely a statement of predicted expenses, a budget supposedly expressed a reasoned and purposive plan.

Unfortunately, underlying definitions often have been neglected or forgotten. The "why and to what end" aspect of budgeting frequently has been submerged. In some cases, budgeting is merely the listing of probable payrolls (complete with names, serial numbers, and salaries) and the itemizing of probable supply and equipment purchases, utility bills, and travel expense accounts. In situations where the level of budgeting sophistication is somewhat higher, attention centers upon "what are you going to do?" rather than so exclusively on "what will you spend?" Rarely, however, does budgeting practice draw attention primarily to *the intended outcomes of planned operations.* Yet the mission and the functions of an organized enterprise, such as a state education agency, are best viewed and best expressed as the major intended outcomes or consequences of the agency's efforts.

The current interest in systems approaches has a major virtue. Systems advocates typically urge that attention be focused on outcomes: what do you intend to *accomplish* by putting your planned and programmed activities into operation? Obviously, the question is not new, but the systems advocates––particularly regarding PPB systems (i.e., various planning-programming-budgeting systems which often include an evaluation component)––have given it a healthy new visibility.

Management has reason to worry over such questions, of course. Management concerns include: What do we intend to bring about? With what actions? How intensively? How rapidly? At what cost? Because these questions involve investments, work measurements, and observed outcomes, management inevitably comes to consider relationships between costs and performance or costs and outcomes. "Systems" help both to raise and to treat these matters.

A SYSTEMS VIEW OF AGENCY MANAGEMENT

The systems approach has utility in clarifying relationships. In the following paragraphs, it is used to depict the state education agency as a unified whole (i.e., a system) within the context of other related systems.

First, the state education agency is seen as a subsystem of larger systems: it is a very small subsystem within "Western Civilization," for example; and it is also a subsystem of such larger systems as society, the state, state government, the educational system of the state, and the educational system of the nation.

Second, the agency also may be seen as an entire system, with its own set of internal subsystems, that interacts with other systems. And the agency is identified as the type of social system termed an "enterprise."

Agency as System and Subsystem

Society operates in ways which let us observe patterns of behavior that together are labeled as the culture. The culture of a given state, a "parent" system that greatly affects smaller components, builds a general environment that influences its subsystems, including the state education agency. From this perspective, a state education agency is a single unit within an interacting constellation of separate units. State government, another "parent" system, has unique institutional characteristics; these also influence the agency. The current "administration" in state government has special concerns and aspirations; it is a system that influences the agency. Other related and influential systems include: each school, system of schools, or school district; each institution or institutional network of higher education; combinations of districts and institutions; the U.S. Office of Education; associations of publishers, contractors, parents, teachers, students, taxpayers. Each such identifiable system acts upon——and is itself acted on by——the state education agency.

Within the complex environment just sketched, but quite apart from the other self-contained and separately managed enterprises, the state education agency also may be seen as a complete and separate system, a constellation of smaller parts. Membership boundaries clearly mark off its limits. Its bureaus, divisions, task forces, sections, *et al.*, are some of its own subsystems; each subsystem develops special characteristics which, in turn, affect the agency.

The agency is an "enterprise": the distinguishing characteristic of this type of social system is that it is purposive and mission- or goal-oriented, and would not exist except for stated purposes. An enterprise, of course, may be a congenial place for a person to spend his time, but that is not its reason for existence: an enterprise only exists to strive to attain instrumental purposes; it is "mission-oriented." A social club, for example, and other types of social systems are not similarly motivated; their purpose is satisfied by the fact of their existence, and they fade away if existence is not satisfying.

Internal and External Patterns

A state education agency is an enterprise, a purposive, goal-oriented system. Assume that its mission is clear. The agency employs a number of individuals to perform its work. Each individual brings his own purposes or aspirations. Presumably, these are roughly congruent with the agency's, but they are not necessarily identical. The fact of divergent purposes is significant because professional staff members are capable of independent action; they are not mere "hired guns." And the fact complicates life for management.

First, the agency must act in attention to what some sociologists term the "external pattern," i.e., the agency must do what it has to in order to survive and, hopefully, to flourish within its parent systems. The "parents" must believe that the agency is doing something constructive, productive, valuable, etc., with respect to its assigned purposes and goals. In short, management must be sure the agency does produce, so that state government will perceive it to be fulfilling its mission.

Second, the agency must act in attention to the "internal pattern," i.e., the agency must do what is necessary to maintain its staff as a group of effective people organized and able to take purposive institutional action. That means that agency management must arrange for staff specialization and the division of the agency's labor in ways which successfully reconcile (if not entirely match) individuals' goals and aspirations with the purposes and goals chosen by the agency and assigned to the agency by state government and by society. Attention to the demands of the external and internal "patterns" must be accommodated simultaneously.

Interaction and Feedback

Policies, decisions, and actions of the agency are subject to pressures and to constraints, both internal and external. They have effects on individuals and on other systems, both internal and external. Some relationships are direct, explicit, and explainable. Some are as obscure or subtle as the connection between a Presidential nose cold and the Dow Jones stock average.

Whether the contact points are obvious or hidden, each component of a system appears to be connected to all other components; and each subsystem appears to be connected to all other subsystems. It is as though all parts were in an uneasy state of equilibrium, and any move, anywhere, evokes a sequence of adjustments here and there: to jiggle one bit of a mobile sculpture initiates a multitude of changed relationships. Not all the connections are known, and not all cause and effect relationships are clear. It is clear, however, that there *are* internal and external connections, relationships, and repercussions as systems act, interact, emit impulses, receive and digest feedback, and undergo change.

MANAGEMENT REDEFINED

Earlier, management was defined as the institutional capability to select, provide, maintain, and improve or enhance arrangements for effective delivery of appropriate public services. The agency is a vehicle for delivering services, and management controls and directs the vehicle.

Using some systems terminology, these thoughts may be restated to illuminate more fully the meaning of "control and direct," hence to help in thinking about management.

For example, "effective delivery of appropriate public services" now should connote something like this: accomplishment of activities that let the agency survive and flourish within the environment of its parent systems, because those systems believe that the agency is achieving desirable results in fulfillment of assigned mission or purposes. Similarly, "select, provide, maintain, and enhance the arrangements" should connote something like this: find able people; put them in positions where their predispositions match the institution's mission, functions, and goals as interpreted by management; and provide logistical and other support which permits them to proceed effectively and enthusiastically with the conduct of purposive operations.

"Management," therefore, may be abstracted as somewhat different than "operation" or "agency performance." Operations deliver public services. Management figures out what services *need* to be delivered, decides which *are* to be delivered, and *makes* delivery possible.

With respect to the parent system––i.e., to state government––an agency's management is a two-way communications center. Management must communicate to the governor, legislature, budget bureau, planning agency, *et al.*, all of those facts, judgments, and ideas needed for state government to generate policy decisions and to assign missions, purposes and goals to the agency. When those decisions and basic assignments are made, management must translate them into a form that will lead to best use and wisest adjustments in the agency's total capabilities.

As perceived by the governor, the legislature, and the rest, state education agency management may appear to be their agents in charge of running the education business; agency management must be able, as necessary, to play that role for that audience. As perceived by many clients of the agency––and by some of its own staff––agency management may appear to be their emissaries, sent to represent them before state government. Agency management must be able to play that role also. As agency management views itself and the agency, however, it must remain aware that it "runs" only one mission-oriented department of state government; and that defines its prime role.

Internal and External Management Considerations

The state sustains its state education agency so that the agency, acting for state government, may––through fulfillment of the threefold mission––make the optimum contribution to the satisfaction of educational needs and the solution of educational problems *in the statewide educational system.* The needs and problems at issue are "out there" in the system, not within the agency. The basic concerns of the agency, therefore, are also "out there" in the educational system, not inside the agency.

On the other hand, the agency is itself a part of the educational system. Therefore, even some part of its concern for what is "out there" must be addressed to the agency itself. Systems intersect with other systems.

Furthermore, the agency is a separate system. Therefore, in addition to its major efforts to have an effect upon the statewide educational system, it is obligated to pay some attention to itself.

Management of the agency may be regarded as a device for mediating and balancing the several sets of concerns. One major set of management duties and responsibilities has to do with "the seventh function"––the internal governance or management of the state education agency, the agency being a complex, bureaucratic, mission-oriented enterprise of state government, active in education. The other major set has to do with the first six functions, and with the *use* of the agency as an instrument intended to have a constructive impact on others, causing those others to take constructive action.

This formulation seems to be quite accurate: management is intended to control and direct. Agency operations are intended (within limits) to control and direct the statewide educational system. Therefore, with respect to the educational system, the state education agency *per se* is a management unit: not the *only* such unit in the statewide system, but a vital one.

Internally, management controls and directs the conduct of the agency's operations: Through the performance of those operations, the purpose is to enable state government to satisfy its obligations for delivery of public services in education. Internal management is concerned with the suitability of agency operations; the effectiveness, economy, and efficiency with which those operations are conducted; and the efficacy or utility of performing such operations, as observed in their effects upon the remainder of the educational system and, in fact, upon the quality of life in the state.

Externally, the purpose is to exert the greatest possible constructive influence upon others, in the direction of satisfaction of major educational needs, and to cause or encourage those others to deliver the appropriate educational services. As stated earlier, its "mission" calls for the agency to *advise* state government regarding education; when state expectations are stipulated, to *ascertain* whether desired conditions are being met; and, whenever circumstances are deemed unsatisfactory, to *assure* that deficiencies are corrected.

Thus the agency *controls* its own internal organizational pattern, *influences* overall organization of the statewide system, and may *advise* other components of the system regarding their own internal organization. Similarly, it is agency management's internal task, using the staffing process, to man the agency; it is the agency's function externally to have constructive effects upon the staffing needs and capabilities of the statewide educational system and, consequently, upon the broader manpower problem of "staffing" the economy.

Internally, management is fully authorized to control and direct agency operations. Externally, the agency has (in many cases, if not all) limited powers; it may not be fully authorized to control and direct the actions of other institutions and enterprises. In both cases––internally and externally––agency management's obligation is to act deliberately in an effort to control and direct the course of educational events.

"Guide, influence, and lead" or "advise, ascertain, and assure" are much more gentle words than "control and direct," of course. Both groups of words are applicable in either setting, that is, internal or external. The gentler words are in many ways preferable; they convey a tone and suggest a style of management that is readily palatable to those who prefer "participatory" management.

If one accepts the view that the state education agency is a state government's management center for the statewide educational system, it is clear that both state government and the agency––in most states––utilize participatory management: public schools are a state responsibility, but a great deal of responsibility and authority are delegated to local educational units; within the state agency, similarly, considerable latitude is granted to staff members to design their own work. Within the agency, staff is given some latitude because management attempts to reconcile staff predispositions and interests with the agency's needs. Outside––in the statewide educational system––it may be said that "local control" of schools reflects an analogous wish: to reconcile local predispositions and interests with the basic mandates of state government regarding education.

Agency Purposes and Staff Preferences

Many staff members view themselves only as professionals or specialists who happen to be in the employ of state government, and there is nothing harmful in that. Management personnel, however, no matter what other discipline, profession, or specialty they may claim, must acknowledge that they also are public administrators. They act on behalf of state government within the field of education, and they must behave accordingly: i.e., they must act on the agency's internal management or governance and on the performance of its external operations.

Agency operations are addressed basically to the statewide educational system, where the major needs and problems are. The statewide system is huge, as compared to the agency, so that it is not only of greater intrinsic importance but also of greater natural appeal. For an agency staff member, therefore, the neat and tidy governance of the agency is highly unlikely to be more than a matter of collateral interest and is very apt to be scorned as of no import whatsoever. Management personnel cannot share that view.

It can be argued that "neat and tidy governance" of the agency is an indispensable prerequisite, that it is essential to the success of agency efforts addressed to statewide tasks, and that "sloppy" internal governance invariably is disruptive, hence destructive of the agency's ability to perform.

Such arguments are not likely to impress most staff members. They should be digested and believed by management personnel, however, because they are basic tenets of their obligations as public administrators within state government. Furthermore, they prove to be valid when the agency undertakes to influence other institutions, enterprises, and school districts. That is, the agency presumes to urge and even to demand that others must run well-managed shops. If it will demand that of others, it should be willing to demand as much of itself. If the agency does not run a reasonably "tight ship," it finds itself in an awkward position.

Effective internal governance of the state education agency—–even if "trim and shipshape" are not the most exciting of words—–is essential to agency performance of its more fundamental tasks, to evoking its major functions, and to fulfilling its mission. If its internal governance were grossly inept, prospects would not be bright for the agency's contribution to major educational problems and issues.

Beyond that, agency management—–given suitable internal governance—–is free to deal and able to deal effectively with the fundamental concerns of the agency. Pursuant to its mission (to advise, to ascertain, and to assure), an agency will wish:

1. To anticipate and swiftly identify educational needs.

2. To invent—–or find and bring to light—–the means to meet those needs.

3. To take or stimulate action along the lines thus indicated.

4. To evaluate: i.e., to check on progress achieved, as a basis for redefining needs and redirecting further inquiry or action.

These are the fundamental concerns of agency management both in their "public administrator" capacities and in their capacities as educators.

People who reach management positions within state education agencies presumably do so because they are interested in ideas and skilled in their use. They find it congenial to deal with ideas, concepts, policies, and priorities.

Any test of their adequacy as agency top management must center upon their agency's achievements with respect to the fundamental items: anticipate and identify needs; invent or uncover means to meet needs; act or stimulate action; and evaluate outcomes. All of these are "idea" matters.

Internal governance of the agency itself also involves ideas. However, it is often believed that management people concentrate more on dollars and things and people—–on budgets and equipment and space, on staffing problems and reporting problems and deadlines—–than on ideas or concepts. People whose primary interests lie in ideas about education may not find it congenial to devote themselves to matters that they believe to be more mundane. Thus, even members of management may look upon the agency's internal management as one of the necessary evils. If they should act accordingly, the agency is in trouble.

It is true, of course, that economy and efficiency in internal governance are valuable only insofar as they facilitate or hamper performance of the many activities through which the agency seeks to fulfill its external, statewide mission. Having conceded the primacy of one set of management responsibilities over the other, however, the fact remains that agency management must be skilled, effective, and diligent in fulfilling both sets. Management cannot be successful otherwise.

Management Processes and Agency Functions

The concern of a state education agency's top management is to evoke all seven functions or intended consequences, each of which may be seen as a milepost en route to fulfillment of the agency's threefold mission. An agency has only one staff, only one "top management," and only one set of selected activities. The one top management accepts an obligation to control and direct all efforts of the agency. These include the activities whereby the function of internal management is evoked. They also include the activities whereby the agency seeks to evoke the functions of research, information and statistics, distribution of financial and material resources, advice and assistance, regulation and licensing, and special operations and facilities. Within the legal and political limits of its power, the agency seeks to manage the statewide educational system by evoking those six functions. The management processes used by top management to control and direct internal affairs of the agency are used in turn by the agency to control and direct educational affairs throughout the state.

Each function may be advanced, affected, or influenced––deliberately or accidentally, directly or incidentally––by a number of the agency's scores or hundreds of activities. One activity may have an effect on one or more functions. All agency activities are devised, performed, and evaluated by the agency's one and only staff, under the control and direction of the agency's one and only top management, utilizing the one basic set of management processes. One staff member may play a part in performing one or more of the activities, hence may play a part in advancing or otherwise affecting one or more of the seven functions. Frequently, a given activity or a given staff member may be seen to play a part, therefore, both in "the seventh function"––internal management of the agency––and in one or more of the other six outward-looking functions.

There certainly is nothing surprising in these many interrelationships and overlaps. The state education agency exists because it is intended to act upon the statewide systems of education and of government, not because it is an adornment to state government. The seventh function—–internal management—–is a facilitative function, sought and prized not so much for its own beauties and virtues as for the fact that it is an essential prerequisite for achievement of the other six functions. It would be a source of surprise or even of disappointment, therefore, if the performers and the activities most directly related to the agency's internal management were not also related to the other six functions, or if the internally and externally related activities were found not to intersect, overlap, and interrelate.

Fortunately, there is a kind of family resemblance between, on the one hand, the activities whereby the management processes are utilized to evoke the seventh function and, on the other hand, the tasks and activities by which an agency pursues the other six functions. If one chooses to regard the agency *en toto* as a "management" component of the entire statewide educational system the six functions may be seen to be analogous to the management processes: the management processes are means for arranging satisfactory performance by the agency; the six functions which are sought to be evoked "out there," similarly, are means to arrange for satisfactory performance by the many other self-contained and independently operated enterprises called schools, colleges, school districts or school systems. The management processes are utilized by the agency in deciding when and how to evoke desired outcomes throughout the state and—–within the limits of the agency's powers—–in following through to bring them about.

Utilizing a "systems approach," all of education within a state can be seen to comprise one large and moderately well-integrated system; the state education agency can be seen to comprise one small, compact, and presumably very well-integrated enterprise within that system. This approach facilitates the view—–the useful fiction, if you will—–that the educational system is a single, purposive, mission- or goal-oriented entity, and that the state education agency is a management component of that entity, acting for state government.

Six functions––research, information and statistics, advice and assistance, distribution of financial and material resources, regulation and licensing, and special operations and facilities––are the desired outcomes of the agency's efforts "out there," the intended consequences of the agency's performance "out there." To whatever extent they become actual and observable consequences, these six desired outcomes––not the dollars which it administers––constitute the agency's "input" to the statewide educational system, because they enhance the capability of other enterprises to manage themselves, to fulfill their own missions, to deliver their services to the public, and to be accountable for their own performance. If the state education agency did not distribute any money to other enterprises, in other words, the agency would be making a valuable input to the statewide system as long as it evoked these six outcomes. This point can be seen vividly if one deletes from the agency's activities all duties connected with disbursing funds to school districts. The ability to dispense funds gives the agency a "carrot and stick" capability it might not have otherwise, but it does not change the agency's mission or the six desired outcomes it seeks to evoke within the statewide system.

With an eye to its obligation to advise state government, the state education agency must be able to identify objectives and problems, needs and resources, and criteria and standards which are applicable "out there," to analyze alternative policies and activities, and to determine resource needs and allocation patterns which are applicable "out there." The tasks, activities, and talents involved in doing so are very much akin to the tasks, activities, and talents required for the agency's internal management, in anticipating futures, planning, programming, financing, budgeting, and evaluating the agency's own work.

The activities undertaken by an agency in pursuit of its six functions "out there," hence in pursuit of its threefold mission, not only resemble but also rely upon the management processes. In "anticipating futures," for example, agency management inevitably considers futures not only as they might affect the state education agency, but also as they might affect the entire statewide educational system.

To consider resource needs and allocation patterns throughout the educational system, for example, relies on concepts and techniques similar to those which undergird financing and budgeting for internal management. Tasks and activities selected vis-a-vis the function of regulation and licensing are akin to those in controlling for internal management. The processes of internal management called "controlling" and "evaluating" rely on techniques and methods similar in concept if not in detail to those relied on to ascertain whether the conditions extant throughout the state match those stipulated in state policies, priorities, and standards. The difference between "evaluating," described earlier as part of internal management, and "assessing" is mainly a difference in subjects: the state agency "evaluates" itself and "assesses" others, but the essential logic, approach, and methodologies are similar in the two cases.

Also, the functions of research, information and statistics, and advice and assistance involve tasks or activities in which the agency will perform or stimulate research, development, testing, demonstration, and diffusion or dissemination. These tasks or activities call for the skills and techniques required in the agency's internal management planning, evaluating, and institutional development. To whatever extent a state education agency actually distributes resources to other entities, the distribution process is likely to resemble the budgeting process as applied to internal management. Whenever a state education agency addresses attention to school district consolidation, to intermediate districts, to interdistrict cooperation, or to possibilities for regional entities within the statewide educational system, it calls upon skills, techniques, and knowledge equivalent to those used internally in the management process of organizing. Other applications of the management processes to the functions are readily described.

At least two observations may be derived from the foregoing. First, it seems clear enough that agency "top management" personnel must be fully attuned to their internal and external obligations. Second, if top management can successfully demonstrate that internal and external matters are closely related and interdependent, management should be enabled to overcome whatever distaste may be displayed by the agency's own personnel for the "scullery work" of internal management.

MANAGEMENT PROCESS REDEFINED

Earlier, the management processes were introduced and discussed with reference to their use only in achieving effective internal management of the agency itself. The discussion just offered, however, illustrates their applicability to the agency's efforts——no matter how circumscribed these may be by law, political constraints, or limits of agency resources——to manage the statewide educational system. The twelve management processes now may be defined to encompass their applicability for both internal and external management, as follows.

> ***Anticipating Futures:*** Systematically considering the conditions and circumstances the agency and the statewide educational system may confront some years hence.
>
> ***Planning:*** Establishing or clarifying the purposes, goals, and objectives that the agency and the statewide educational system shall pursue during the near future.
>
> ***Programming:*** Conceiving, considering, and selecting plausible options which the enterprise may exercise in pursuing the stipulated purposes, goals, and objectives.

Financing: Deciding on resource requirements, and undertaking to obtain the needed resources.

Budgeting: Reducing longer range plans, priorities, and policies to detailed plans of operations for the coming fiscal period.

Controlling: Determining that activities are performed as planned, programmed, and budgeted, and that each work plan is executed.

Organizing: Shaping the agency's own structure (a) to conduct its activities and (b) to derive maximum advantage from staff talents, while allowing maximum leeway for staff predispositions. Similarly, shaping the structure of the statewide educational system.

Staffing: Determining personnel requirements, then recruiting, selecting, developing and rewarding the personnel actually engaged.

Administering: Day-to-day decision making, scheduling, supervising, and coordinating of work, in optimum fulfillment of the planned, programmed, and budgeted activities.

Evaluating: Measuring and judging the extent to which activities——duly planned, programmed, budgeted, and executed——are achieving the intended purposes, goals, and objectives. (Perhaps it is useful to reserve "evaluating" for reference to the SEA's appraisals of its own affairs, and to use "assessing" to denote the SEA's analogous examinations of the statewide educational system and its component parts.)

Relationship Building: Maintaining a constructive liaison with each of the "publics" of the SEA and of the statewide educational system, and devising or encouraging new arrangements for interdistrict, intergovernmental, and intersector cooperation or coordination of effort.

> ***Institutional Development:*** Seeking superior means to resolve operating problems encountered within the activities of "education" broadly conceived.

Preparation for Management

In all this discussion, the enterprise in question is the state *education* agency, not any other variety of governmental department. That fact gives some personnel specifications for agency management.

Management personnel need to satisfy these different sets of requirements: requirements imposed because they are engaged in *management;* those imposed because they manage a public enterprise of state *government;* and those imposed because they manage an *educational* enterprise. (It might be correct to add reference to the fact that state government is a political setting, and that politics also impose a few requirements upon management personnel.) The first two sets must be met by management personnel in any unit of state government and, to some extent, by management of any enterprise, governmental or not. The latter set stems from the nature of the industry––i.e., education––and the nature of a state agency's position within that industry. Management personnel must know and understand the industry intimately; and they must be able to put their knowledge and understanding to work through productive action.

Reference to education as an industry––e.g., the "knowledge industry"––can be very illuminating. For example, it helps to dispose of the chicken-and-egg problem: it is sometimes asked whether people engaged in the management of education are or should be managers who will try to learn something about education, or educators who must try to learn something about management and public administration. The question is inane in any case. If education is recognized as an industry, the case is very clear: members of an industry––including management personnel––normally are drawn from a variety of disciplines, professions, trades, crafts, and other specializations.

Very simply: to deliver public services, the agency needs able and knowledgeable managers of an educational public enterprise within "the knowledge industry." How they happen to equip themselves for that role––whether they start out as scholars or as practitioners, either in or out of the educational field––scarcely matters; what does matter is that they become so equipped. Both education and management––and especially the public rather than private variety of each––cross a great many boundaries that ostensibly separate one field of work from another. "Able and knowledgeable managers of an educational public enterprise" might be cultivated in any number of disciplines, professions, and scientific or technological specializations. One of top management's interests, it should follow, is deliberately to cultivate various fields, to produce or select precisely the people that are needed.

To pursue the point a bit further, an individual may be a profound and splendid scholar and writer in a given field, but nevertheless be an inept practitioner, a boring speaker, or hopeless as an administrator. Neither management nor education should be thought to be an exceptional case, in this respect; i.e., even the most profound and splendid scholar of either *educational, governmental,* or *management* theory and practice may prove to be less than adequate as a manager of an educational enterprise.

Management personnel must be knowledgeable and able: knowledgeable about the "industry," their own role, and the demands of both; and able to generate action. Capability demonstrated in practicing, researching, or operating assignments may or may not be accompanied by capability in managing to deliver public services. "Proper" preparation, therefore, remains undefined, as is the case in other settings: that's why some fine players make poor coaches, and some fine coaches make poor general managers; that's why some superb scholars make poor university presidents; that's why there is no Ph.D. program available for "preparing" job-ready presidents, senators, chief corporate executives, or other management-and-leadership personages.

V.

Activating and Improving Management Processes

Several clues have appeared earlier regarding ways to assess the adequacy of performance of each process, activate each process, and improve state education agency management. First and foremost, matters hinge on management's psychological outlook toward the public administration of an agency of state government active in the area of education.

The agency has a mission to fulfill on behalf of state government. It has assigned responsibilities to satisfy. It has authority to act. State government presumably holds the agency accountable for its performance with respect to that set of mission, responsibilities, and authority. The psychological "set" of agency personnel needs to be oriented accordingly. Management people in the state agency cannot pretend that they are in the "teaching profession," for example, because there is no call for them to teach. Once they acknowledge that they are in the "state government/management/education" profession, improvement of agency management becomes much more likely.

Second, each management process is both a management matter and a technical matter. When engaged in management, one must be "knowledgeable"; when performing agency operations, however, a person must be "skillful." Management personnel engage less in "doing" than in seeing to it that the doing takes place and in making use of the results. This is fortunate, because one can become quite knowledgeable about many things fairly readily, but specialized skills come more slowly. The observation is as true with respect to technical specialties used to activate the management processes, of course, as it is with respect to any other specialization utilized by the agency.

The chief state school officer need not be a specialist in, say, vocational education in order to manage an agency which performs vigorous activities in that area. By the same token, he need not be a specialist in organizing, staffing, or any one of the other management processes merely because he manages an agency that utilizes such processes. Neither the chief nor any other member of management can be a specialist in all things.

On the other hand, if he will manage an agency engaged in vocational education, the chief must be knowledgeable enough about that problem area to make certain that his agency employs able specialists and undertakes useful activities. Similarly, to activate twelve complicated and interrelated management processes, the chief must be certain that his agency's staff possesses (or has access to) talents that include all appropriate management-related professional and technical knowledges, skills, and techniques.

To enumerate the twelve processes is to outline an agency's shopping list for the knowledges and techniques required for effective agency management. Personnel administration, for example, has one set of specialized professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Budgeting has another. Evaluation may develop yet another. Management makes use of talents in such fields as accountancy, controllership, data processing, planning, procurement, work measurement, public relations, law, and information systems. Sometimes one person supplies several of these talents; other specialists are available when needed from other agencies or institutions.

In short, the basic "method" for improving overall management or for improving the agency's implementation of any management process is so simple that it easily can be overlooked. Agency leadership must acknowledge the seventh function––internal management––as a major identifiable concern just as the other six functions are its concerns, and just as vocational education, school district tax policies, computer-assisted instruction, and school libraries are among its concerns. Agency leadership must act to locate and rely on people able to activate management processes, just as it does to secure competent advice plus adequate staff for all other important agency activities.

THREE APPROACHES TO MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT

Three general routes are useful in improving agency management. Detailed suggestions are not offered. Because there are more than fifty agencies, all very different and with differing requirements, no prescription could serve them all. These three approaches, however, could be applied in each agency. The three are not mutually exclusive, but rather are overlapping and mutually reinforcing; a three-pronged attack with emphasis and timing varied to suit local needs and possibilities.

1. ***Improve Staff Resources.*** As indicated in the opening paragraphs of this section, the first "method" to improve management is to (a) acknowledge that the agency's internal management requires staff time, staff effort, and staff competencies, (b) secure the services of appropriate professionals and specialists, and (c) cause their time and effort to be invested in management processes.

2. ***Improve the "Management Systems Complex" of Basic Processes and Supporting Procedures.*** There are twelve management processes. Implementation of each process––alone and in combination with others––can be strengthened deliberately. Typically this is achieved by (a)

strengthening supporting procedures and (b) building the underlying information base to yield a useful "management systems complex."

3. ***Clarify and Improve Agency Goals, Priorities, and Programs.*** The agency is a purposive, mission-oriented enterprise. Clarification of goals is basic to improved conduct of the enterprise. The literature of education stresses "behavioral objectives" in a teaching-learning situation. The literature of modern management stresses analogous objectives in the conduct of an enterprise. This means, of course, moving from general pietistic expressions regarding education to more explicit delineations of attainable objectives and related agency activities.

The three approaches are discussed rather briefly below––briefly, because only generalizations are pertinent to all state education agencies. The sequence in which they are treated is not intended to suggest anything about their relative merit, comparative importance, or priority.

APPROACH No. 1:
IMPROVING STAFF

Everything said in the preceding pages should establish the importance of recruiting, retaining, and developing competent management personnel. A few added notes may be useful, however.

One individual may engage in both "management" and "operation," or in activities both of internal management and of the other six functions, as observed in the preceding section. Certainly in a relatively small agency, with limited staff, each professional may have to play more than one position on the team. Even in a large agency, where staff is adequate to permit a good deal of specialization and division of labor, it may be useful to conduct affairs so that each professional will develop more than one usable set of proficiencies or engage in activities related to more than one function.

What is critical, however, is that each person know when he is engaged in a managerial rather than an operating task; and that he consider whether, for the management task at hand, he needs the advice or assistance of others. An agency which may engage vigorously in rendering professional assistance and consulting service to others certainly ought to develop a sensitivity which enables it to recognize when it––or any part of its staff––needs to receive such service.

More particularly, an educational enterprise should assure that its staff will receive the necessary education, training, or work experience.

Every professional on the staff underwent 16–plus years of preservice education and training, probably supplemented by work experience, before joining the agency. While a staff member, he undergoes additional inservice education or training. At the point where he is scheduled to enter a management position, the staff member should be regarded (and should be induced to see himself) as a person about to enter a new profession: previously a specialist, hereafter to be a generalist and executive who will look to the performance of a major substantive program as a whole.

If so viewed, it should become evident that some mid-career education and training now would be necessary and appropriate. The preservice preparation presumably yielded general education plus reasonable acquaintance with a discipline, a profession, or another category of moderate specialization. The inservice portion presumably was oriented to particular position requirements and to agency practice.

Mid-career preparation for management responsibility presumably would be tailor-made for each individual. It would acknowledge the multiple requirements of the governmental, managerial, and educational characteristics of the education industry and of state education agency management.

APPROACH NO. 2:
IMPROVING THE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS COMPLEX

Improvement of the processes can be accomplished by strengthening the procedures, techniques, and systems that support them. These comprise an interlocking complex of management systems. If well conceived, the systems complex is firmly rooted in a reliable information base and in a logic that is compatible with PPB or comparable systems.

Experienced and proficient practitioners have developed bodies of technique by which to activate each of the dozen processes. Knowledge of such technique can be acquired by appropriate staffing, including adept use of consultants. Application and utilization of the processes, however, depend fundamentally on top management's disposition to become knowledgeable about such matters, to develop a sensitivity to the condition of each process and its activation, and to cause appropriate steps to be taken toward improvement.

A "management systems complex" contains such systems and orderly procedures as these: budgeting; budgetary accounting; revenue accounting; general accounting; payroll; payroll distribution; procurement; inventory; work measurement; recruiting; training; disbursing. Each is used to attend to a specific task. Each is a "housekeeping" matter, in one respect. Each generates its own record-keeping requirements.

In addition all such systems have information-generating capacity. Therefore, all can be designed to serve to support planning, programming, budgeting, controlling, evaluating, and the other management processes. All can be designed and utilized to determine how, whether, and to what extent assigned responsibilities have been satisfied and authority has been exercised, these determinations being fundamental to the recently reemphasized concept of "accountability." The several systems can be designed and installed sequentially, to a great extent, if they are conceived as parts of an integrated whole;

their development therefore can be accomplished in increments, one secure step at a time.

The theoretical framework inherent in "PPB"––i.e., planning, programming, and budgeting systems––is a most useful starting point for (a) appraising the present condition of the twelve management processes and (b) developing and instrumenting the kind of useful management systems complex that helps to make all processes operative. (This positive reference to the theoretical underpinnings of PPB systems does not constitute advocacy or endorsement of any system now extant. Theory stands ahead of practice. This is, in effect, a call to exercise the management process herein termed "institutional development," to develop satisfactory solutions to the agency's operating problems of planning, programming, budgeting, and evaluating.)

The trio of processes which give their names to PPB are an interrelated core of management and a core for relating all management processes. PPB systems do not consist exclusively of planning, programming, and budgeting as these three terms are defined here, but are based on them. The three processes direct attention to the purposes or ends of the enterprise, hence are focused on matters that are essential to the emergence of "leadership." They contain a built-in inducement and methodology for the state education agency to shift its emphasis (if it has not done so already) from service activities and *pro forma* regulatory activities to activities which are more clearly mission- and function-oriented. Inherently, they require careful analysis and procedures, and PPB systems therefore are likely to draw upon the more sophisticated thinking in the field of management or administration.

The basic systems that permit management to begin to develop a PPB type of capability and the capacity for a management systems complex are a large bite, but not an unmanageable one. The PPB theory base provides an excellent starting point in several respects. It provides the logic for such instrumental tasks as designing internal budgetary procedures, revenue and expenditure accounting, and payroll distribution practices. When instrumented, these supply much of the data base for internal management. It provides the logic for the exercise––discussed below––of clarifying goals and objectives, activities, and priorities. It has utility both for managing the agency and for enabling the agency to help manage the educational system of the state. Finally, it lends itself reasonably well to an incremental approach to construction of the management systems complex.

The suggested theory base not only emphasizes planning and purposing, but also emphasizes a budgeting system, financial accounting system, work measurement system, and related instrumentation, all of which must be capable of processing fiscal and other data to yield the kinds of information on which management relies. For example, a budgetary accounting system is not only a device for agency fiscal housekeeping, it also must feed into a broader "management information system" or into a "statewide educational information system."

A "management information system" may be defined as an integrated, logically related set of policies, procedures, and processes for collecting, ordering, storing, retrieving, analyzing, and reporting information required for effective discharge of management's responsibilities. Such systems contribute to strengthening the dozen management processes, hence also to strengthening efforts to evoke all desired functions pursuant to the agency mission. Each process has special information requirements, but some types of information satisfy requirements of several processes. Planning, programming, and budgeting are perhaps the most voracious processes in terms of their demands for reliable information.

At present, no one knows what a "total" management information or educational information system would be or even if such a phenomenon is possible. Some parts of such a system are known, however, and reasonably well-established technique is available for instrumenting them. An "incremental" approach to system development is dictated by circumstance, therefore. It is highly desirable in any case; as an old Spanish proverb says, *"Quien mucho abarca poco aprieta,"* which means about the same as "Don't bite off more than you can chew."

The availability of information is a good measure of the present condition of the management processes. It also is a good measure of the agency's present ability to select and perform activities which are likely to evoke the consequences that are desired "out there" within the statewide educational system. "Information" does not mean exhaustive inventories of detailed data. Data are informative when they are condensed and arrayed to make them useful to agency staff and management. Elaborate data regarding one student may constitute "information" for his parents and teachers; the same data, in the same form, would not be useful to state agency management. A rule of parsimony must be applied so that agency management can be informed but not inundated, and so that management can consider questions that may lead to programmed activity.

The agency may possess much data about its own operations. It also may possess much data about each pupil, staff member, school building, school district, district budget, and curriculum in the state. Details in these data may be necessary for certain agency operations, but they must be greatly digested in order to be helpful to management in PPB types of efforts. The PPB type of effort, it will be seen, firmly establishes a clear connection between agency activities related to the function termed internal management and those related to the other six agency functions. For example, management may ask these questions:

> Is there a school within reach of every potential student in the state? How many clients do not have a facility within reach? ***What would it take to reduce that number to zero? Who can do "it"? What should the agency do?***

> How many staff members, now deemed to be suitably qualified for their positions in the educational system, are within how many years of retirement? How many additions are likely to be needed how soon? At what rate is higher education preparing them? ***What would it take to make certain that the system is adequately staffed? Who can do it? What shall the agency do?***
>
> To what extent do school districts attempt to reduce unemployment, to hire the "unemployables," and to relieve professional staff of tasks that can be delegated to others, by engaging sub- or paraprofessional personnel? Is there a career ladder available to such personnel? Do staff development activities cover these matters? ***What would it take to induce constructive action? Who can do it? What shall the agency do?***

A suitable management systems complex obviously extends well beyond mere housekeeping, although it accomplishes a good deal of housekeeping too. The orientation of the complex––if based upon the PPB framework––would be to action, to change, and to improvement, hence to "leadership" derived from fulfillment of functions.

In many respects, the budget-related (hence "program-oriented") accounting system is the spine of an informative management systems complex. To build that system––a computer-based system almost necessarily––would be a very constructive first stage of an incremental effort toward development of the complex. The accounting system should be informative on such internal matters as: (a) costs, intended and actual, per agency activity; (b) costs, intended and actual, per "program" and in terms of several "program structures" (discussed below); (c) costs per organizational unit; (d) revenues, estimated and actual, per source; and (e) connections between revenue sources, organizational units, and activities (e.g., what source finances which activities performed by whom? or who performs which share of specified activities?).

This one system will greatly strengthen planning, programming, and budgeting if it is well conceived and vigorously utilized by management. It will, among other things, stimulate efforts to identify and measure both work performed and results achieved by the agency. For example, cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness analyses, which are integral parts of PPB approaches, can be applied only when costs *and* measurements of work performed *and* appraisals of achievement all are available. An accounting system is the only reliable source of cost data.

If the agency can develop an effective system for determining its own costs, it will enhance its position in demanding comparable data from others (e.g., from local school districts). Also, as the agency enhances its own skill in matters of planning, programming, budgeting, measurement and evaluation, it will become increasingly able to advise and assist others on such matters.

APPROACH NO. 3: IMPROVING AND CLARIFYING GOALS, PRIORITIES, AND PROGRAMS

The agency is an enterprise. It is purposive and mission-oriented. Each activity it initiates and maintains, therefore, should be selected and retained only if it is expected to help attain one or more near-term targets or objectives, congruent with one or more basic but somewhat more remote goals, pursuant to underlying public policy, and en route to evoking the intended consequences or functions, in partial fulfillment of mission.

"Goals" are broad, basic, long-range, and very possibly unattainable; they express the aspirations built into public policy, but do not necessarily specify details of action to be taken. "Objectives" or "targets" are relatively short-range, specific, narrow, intermediate––and comparatively more attainable——ends. They are congruent with goals; they also are congruent with observable reality, and they permit the selection of purposive courses of action.

To illustrate suppose that we agree that public policy advocates "universal, free, and equal public educational opportunity, so that each individual may fulfill his aspirations to the limits of his capacity." The policy is an interesting and useful guide, but is not a blueprint for action by state government, by the state education agency, or by schools and other entities in the statewide educational system.

This is the case because: (a) existing educational institutions and facilities are insufficient to the unlimited need it suggests; (b) resources——human, financial, material——are not available for unlimited expansion of institutions and other facilities; and (c) it is questionable at best whether we know how to enable each individual to ingest educational opportunity to the limit of his capabilities. Besides, the educational aspiration competes for attention and for resources with society's other major aspirations, each of which is susceptible to similar limitations. (A broadly stated public policy of "unlimited health for everyone," for example, runs into the facts of limited existing facilities, limited usable resources, and the flaw that the medical sciences simply do not know how to grant immunity from cancer or the common cold, much less to assure immortality.)

More limited goals and objectives can be identified by the state education agency, however, and commended to state government as a current elaboration of the basic public policy: e.g., a pertinent "goal" might be the elimination of illiteracy; a concrete "objective" could be to reduce the number of adult functional illiterates by 10,000 during a specified period. A related course of action can be programmed, not only by the state education agency regarding its own activities, but also by other entities——e.g., districts and colleges——within the educational system.

In this discussion, the primary subject is "the seventh function," internal management of the agency, rather than the conduct of the statewide system. Attention, therefore, is directed to the activities and programs of the agency itself, not to the aggregation of all the goal-oriented activities of all components within the statewide educational system. Efforts analogous to those described in connection with its own internal conduct, however, may be performed by the agency in connection with its external responsibilities, where these matters become more difficult, more complex, and far larger in scale.

Internal and External Programs

The state education agency itself conducts activities and programs. So also does every educational institution or jurisdiction within the state. Taken all together, the many independently managed activities may be perceived as "the total program of the statewide educational system."

It is the state education agency's concern to be superbly well informed about the statewide system's total program, overall and in some degree of detail. It also is the agency's concern to influence that total program in constructive ways. The agency's own program of activities is calculated to act out that concern, i.e., to control and direct the statewide educational system in the progressively more effective delivery of more appropriate public services, by evoking the several intended consequences of agency performance.

The agency, therefore, is required to correlate separate sets of courses of action: (a) courses of action directly *carried out by the agency* with resources its management is empowered literally to control and direct and (b) courses of action *carried out by various other entities,* public and private, which are parts of the statewide educational system, and which the agency can control and direct only to a limited degree.

Agency management needs to be informed about the total program of the statewide educational system. It also needs to be well informed about the agency program. The sheer magnitude of the statewide system, contrasted with the modest size of a state agency, must weigh heavily in agency management's choices of goals, objectives, and its own activities. Most educational operations are conducted by others. Agency activities––if they are somehow to "control and direct" or to "guide, influence, and lead" the conduct of all those independently managed others––need to be highly selective, artfully employed, and accurately applied. In selecting the agency's courses of action, agency management necessarily is concerned about considerations of leverage and of comparative advantage.

That is, in considering how the agency shall act in pursuit of goals and objectives, agency management cannot stop when it has identified actions that need doing. Management also must select the actions that would be most influential in directing the course of educational events. From among these, furthermore, management must identify the few critical actions that only the state education agency can take. When agency resources are limited (and that is a permanent condition), it is doubtful whether the agency should undertake courses of action which local school districts, colleges, and others can be permitted, caused, or encouraged to adopt and carry out.

In short, the agency cannot design its own program of activities except in light of the "statewide educational system's program," viewing that highly decentralized statewide system as though it were a single enterprise (the "systems approach" view which, even though contrary to fact, is a highly useful fiction). Management must ask questions: What needs to happen? What needs to be done? Who can do it?

More particularly, management must ask: Of the things that must be done, which can be accomplished by none other than this agency's direct efforts? Which others appear least likely to be accomplished if the agency does not act? Then the agency is in a position to set its priorities and to decide: What shall *this* agency do?

"Courses of action" by the agency may be conceived in large or small segments, i.e., as the agency's major, main-line "programs" or as its subordinate supporting tasks, activities, and projects. Relatively simple and "bite-sized" units of activity, of course, are most readily administered, quantified, measured, evaluated, and controlled in terms both of "input" (i.e., budgeting, work measurement, etc.) and of "output" (i.e., observable results). The smallest and simplest of objectives tend to be the most readily attained.

Larger and more complex ends——e.g., emergence of the agency functions——may be pursued via conduct of a number of agency activities. These complicate matters. Any given activity of the agency may be a useful and necessary contributor to the attainment of more than one objective and perhaps even for some superficially unrelated objectives. Where objectives are relatively large and complex, the outcomes of effort are relatively difficult to appraise. The overlapping of objectives and activities tends to complicate budgeting, work measurement, and output or outcome measurement and evaluation. Therefore, it is advantageous for management, to the extent possible, to define numerous small objectives, i.e., relatively small targets to which relatively small units of activity may be related.

Programs and Program-Oriented Processes

Management dare not lose sight of larger targets just because of measurement problems. Therefore, clusters of activities may be grouped together as "programs" for such purposes as analysis, definition of objectives, or evaluation. ("Grouped together" in thought or in planning. Please note: whether such activity clusters are combined organizationally is a wholly separate matter.)

A program is one major segment of the purposive and goal-oriented work of the entire agency. A program represents the set of activities that are regarded as similar or related in terms of some ordering principle: for example, in terms of the activities' relationships to the agency's seven functions. To identify and abstract "programs" is a highly useful integrative exercise, partly because it encourages management and staff thinking to cut across organizational boundaries.

To define programs is both a secondary exercise and a trial and error affair, because: (a) the definition of what scope, amount, or area of activities shall be deemed to constitute "one program" is an arbitrary decision; (b) several different sets of program definitions may be equally valid and useful; and (c) a multiplicity of program structures may be necessary if the agency and its *total* program are to be depicted fully and clearly. There are no criteria yet developed that can be applied uniformly to determine how much activity or what kinds of activities shall be grouped to comprise what will be called a program.

One highly useful program structure (i.e., orderly enumeration of activities) is oriented to the agency's seven functions. Another might be oriented to a typology of the state's educational goals and subordinate objectives. Each activity is located in the program structure to show its affiliation with the function (or the goal) to which it most directly relates or contributes. To build either or both of such structures is a useful exercise in judgment and in description.

Multiple Program Structures. However, activities can be ordered rationally on the basis of common characteristics other than relationship to functions or to basic goals To group them on any ordering principle is, in effect, to build a program structure keyed to a stipulated basis for abstraction. Many program structures are conceivable. Perhaps many are useful. For example, every activity of a state education agency is purposive in various senses. It is oriented to a basic goal, hence fits into a goal-oriented program structure. It is designed to facilitate agency attainment of a major "function," hence fits into a function-oriented program structure. Similarly, each activity conceivably may be perceived to be oriented essentially to one grade level of education, to one category of clientele, to one subject matter; hence it fits into grade-oriented, client-oriented, and subject-oriented "program structures," among others.

The most immediately useful program structure is one which effectively depicts the current scope and nature of needs, priorities, and activities and the current view of basic goals and significant objectives. Priorities are subject to change. So are public tastes and political circumstances. Therefore, a multiplicity of program structures and the relatively frequent review and redesign of program structures may prove to be useful and necessary.

Misuse or Misleading Use of "Program." The word "program" (in common with "function," among others) is variously employed. It often is used to indicate the activity performed by an organizational subdivision of the enterprise; hence, for example, "the Voc Ed program" to denote the activities of a vocational education division. The usage probably is unfortunate, because it contradicts the integrative intent of the program concept: i.e., it does not bring together all activities oriented to a substantive aspect of what the agency is in business for; instead, it allows the artificial walls of organizational structure to segregate like activities. "The Voc Ed program" might better be used to denote all activity, no matter by which division it is performed, that may be viewed as a substantive part of the agency's attention to vocational education.

Of course, for those who manage a bureau, division, or other organizational subunit within the agency, it is true that whatever the unit does is "our unit's program"; accounting and other information systems should acknowledge that and serve each unit's management. For top management of the state education agency, however, what that unit does is not automatically a program; it is simply "that segment of program(s) for which the unit is responsible."

A similar view must be maintained by agency management regarding segments of program financed with moneys received from particular sources. Thus the agency's school lunch program would consist of all activities deemed to comprise that program, regardless of the organizational units charged with their conduct, and regardless of the financial sources credited with their support. The activities supported wholly or in part by a given revenue source do not––at least, not for that reason––comprise a recognizable program; they simply remain parts of one or more programs that happen to be beneficiaries of that revenue source.

Decision-Making and PPB Pitfalls

The PPB approach to management matters has a great deal to commend it. It also has several built-in pitfalls, stemming particularly from the apparently rigorous "scientific" use of measurement, data, computers, and relatively exotic systems. These lend an appearance of credibility and authority (or authoritativeness) to PPB-type exercises. They often look better from a distance than they do close up. Possibly there is a direct relationship between their surface credibility and the gullibility of their observer. One is foolish, of course, to ignore his own judgment merely because data have been exposed to a "system" or fed in and out of a computer; it always remains possible that the data are unreliable, the computer faulty, and the scientific system inexact. And educational values may not be susceptible to "computerization." Therefore, PPB cannot replace other bases for judgment; it is a supplement.

Fundamental reservations are proper regarding PPB: some objectives may never be accomplished, some purposes or goals may never be fulfilled, their definitions may be faulty, "best means" may remain unidentified. Reliance upon PPB ought not be so complete that only attainable objectives should be established, nor so presumptuous as to pretend that cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness ratios are the only legitimate guides to further action. Similarly, the use of PPB ought not induce management to leap too quickly to allege that cause-and-effect relationships are clear when inputs of effort are related to observable events. It may be accurate to observe that "we did *this,* and *that* happened"; it does not automatically follow that one event is a consequence or function of the other.

Notwithstanding such reservations, the PPB approach to major aspects of management is logically attractive and highly useful. It attempts to relate ends to means, needs to resources, and inputs to outcomes. As an approach and a developing set of technique, PPB merits serious attention.

The whole question of ends and means is enormously difficult. Questions of value, questions of feasibility, questions of knowledge—these and others make for enormous complication in choosing goals, spelling out objectives, and devising activities and programs. A state education agency's management personnel will find the problem just as humbling as others do. There is no reason to expect "management personnel" to make all the choices, on their own authority, or on the basis of their own knowledge and judgments. Emphasis here on management's role in this matter is not intended to imply greatly centralized decision-making. Some decisions or choices are made by elected legislators; some are imposed by force of circumstance. A good many, in an enterprise staffed largely by professionals, presumably will be made by those whose knowledge and experience are deemed to lend real authority to their views.

Management's obligation is to assure that essential choices are made when they need to be made, by those that may be expected to make them best. There always is a risk of premature closure on considerations of policy or practice, and a companion danger of "freezing" to a dubious pattern. But policies must be adopted, priorities must be set, and actions must be launched, i.e., closure must sometime be reached. Often closure is required although reliable clues are missing, let alone "total information." That is part of what makes management difficult.

The idea of multiple program structures should prove to be useful in this connection. To examine problems in terms of multiple structures may, at times, prevent premature closure.

Also, closure having been reached, to continue the examination of activity, from time to time and in terms of multiple program structures, may both invite and virtually make automatic a certain amount of review and reconsideration and, thereby, may make "freezing" less likely.

Indicated Management Action

The ostensible logic of the problem suggests that management should determine what the agency goals are, then proceed to identification of objectives and on to choice of activities, design of program structures, and so forth. This sequence may work well enough when a major new undertaking is being considered, because management may undertake to define goals and objectives in the abstract. For a going concern, however, an additional route is indicated.

In an established state education agency, management has reason to develop an inventory of existing activities, to answer the question, "Precisely what are we doing?" Many activities already are under way. Presumably, these represent responses to needs that were identified and clear, once upon a time. Management also has reason to develop a companion inventory of the objectives of those activities, asking in each case, "Why is this being done?" Presumably, each activity pursues objectives that were clear, once upon a time. The original motivations may have been forgotten, in which case another question arises, "What reason can be found, if any, to justify the continuation of this activity?"

Working from such inventories, agency management can develop a basis for applying judgments: What is and what ought to be going on in the agency? What are we doing? What should we stop doing? What should be started?

At the close of the "exercise," management should be able to generate its new set of goals, objectives, priorities, and activities; and management should be able also to depict these in clear and descriptive program structures. En route, it is likely that some activities will be scrapped; merely to identify them will suffice as a basis for eliminating them. Similarly en route, it is likely that some objectives will be so evident, and a course of action so clear, that new activities will be initiated.

Planning, programming, budgeting, and virtually all other processes will be worked vigorously in any agency that undertakes this effort. The word "exercise" therefore is used advisedly: a great deal of exercise is involved. A great deal of institutional muscle is built in the process, however. The state education agency that survives the effort will be a healthy and vigorous self-renewing enterprise, adept at exercising leadership for the delivery of educational services.

SUMMARY: MANAGEMENT USE OF PROCESSES

To control and direct an enterprise, people in management positions must make use of a number of processes; that is, they must activate the processes deliberately and use their results constructively. The processes themselves do not compose management; they simply are essential requisites to management. Management consists of the active, purposeful, and integrated use of the processes to control and direct the enterprise. "Good" management activates each process with care and skill and adroitly integrates all of them to maximum advantage.

Twelve processes have been identified and described. Agency management needs to utilize all twelve. Each process has to be activated, i.e., set in operation. Each one has to be instrumented: i.e., regularized as part of standard operating procedures; metered as integral parts of information and reporting systems; and monitored or managed as fundamental concerns of persons in management positions or of staff members who assist them.

To instrument each process is a difficult and sometimes painstaking task. To integrate all twelve so that they are concurrently useful and mutually supportive is far more difficult. Instrumentation requires the efforts of technicians and––to the extent that management is a science––of scientists. However, management is also an art; integration of the processes requires the talents of the artisan, artist, or virtuoso and takes considerable time and practice.

It therefore is exceedingly ambitious to attempt to instrument and to integrate all processes simultaneously. An incremental, step-by-step approach is less dramatic, but usually more rewarding.

Planning, programming, and budgeting are three interrelated processes that may be regarded as the core or ordering principle of "management." Efforts to improve management may very well begin with these three processes. To do so has several virtues: (1) these processes immediately force attention to be directed to ends, means, and ends-means relationships, hence to the essential concerns that ultimately may lead to the emergency of "leadership"; (2) they immediately force attention to be directed to developing such basic information sources as the budgetary accounting system; and (3) they tend to invite application of the most advanced thinking in the study of administration and of analytic methodologies.

Concurrently, however, efforts to improve management also should be directed to the staffing process. To a great extent, it appears that "to control and direct" an enterprise may be interpreted to mean "create an environment that enables and encourages a staff to function at optimum levels." The level of operation and of agency performance is determined very largely by the inherent capability of the staff members as individuals, as well as by their combined capability when conjoined with able management.

* * *

A brief postscript is proper, perhaps. Throughout this monograph, the focus has been on *management,* not on the substantive content of educational problems and issues nor on proposals for their resolution. Different societies and governments have varying views of the proper aims, scope, content, style, or significance of "education." The view that prevails sets the limits within which those who manage are constrained to control and direct the enterprises to which the conduct of educational activity is entrusted. Whatever the constraints may be, the *management* portion of the educational effort will consist of the problems and processes discussed here. Management personnel therefore need management knowledges, understandings, and skills.

Different societies and governments also hold varying expectations regarding the performance of education managers. In the United States, management personnel in education typically are permitted and expected to help chart the course of public affairs. Quite apart from their managerial capabilities, therefore, they are required to be thoughtful and cultivated individuals whose concerns extend well beyond education narrowly defined. Management considerations cannot be divorced from questions of social philosophy and educational purpose, nor from the broadest matters of public policy and governmental endeavor. The educational enterprise is closely related to basic questions of social, cultural, and economic development, to questions of "manpower" and "human resource development," hence to fundamental philosophical issues of the relative importance of economic goals and other considerations. These matters have not been elaborated on here; they do, however, partly define the context within which the discussion of management merits attention.

Bibliographic Notes

A. The following material was supplied by the Division of State Agency Cooperation, U.S. Office of Education. The cooperation of that Division is gratefully acknowledged once again.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 includes, as Title V, provision for grants to strengthen state departments of education. Since fiscal year 1966, annual appropriations of from $17,000,000 to $33,000,000 have been allotted to states to "stimulate and assist" them "in strengthening the leadership resources of their State educational agencies." Most of the Title V funds are distributed upon application within allotments determined by formulas involving state pupil population proportionate to the national total (Section 503). A percentage of the appropriation (initially 15 percent, now 5 percent) is reserved (Section 505) for the funding of projects (generally multi-state) which "hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the solution of problems common to the State educational agencies of all or several States."

Under Section 505, USOE has funded some fifty projects attacking a wide range of problems. Listed below are the identifications and other data about those projects which have some significant relation to the subject of this monograph, and bibliographic data on some of their relevant tangible products.

The numbers preceding the projects are those assigned to them by the Division of State Agency Cooperation, USOE, which administers Title V. The bibliographic listings do not guarantee that the works so identified are or will remain freely available, but the Division of SAC, which may be addressed at

400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202,

will endeavor to provide copies or to direct inquirers to possible sources.

Special Projects Funded Under Section 505, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
Title V

Number	*Identification of Project*	*Administering and Cooperating States*	*Duration of Project*
2	Designing Education for the Future: An Eight-State Project	**Colorado** Ariz., Idaho, Mont., Nev., N. Mex., Utah, Wyo.	12/65 - 6/69
5	Midwestern States Educational Information Project	**Iowa** Colo., Ill., Ind., Kans., Mich., Minn., Mo., Nebr., N. Dak., Ohio, S. Dak., Wis.	1/66 - 9/70
10	Tentative Guides for a State Educational Agency Fiscal, Personnel, and Program Information System	**Maryland** Ky., Miss., N.Y., Ohio, Oreg., S. Dak., Tex.	1/66 - 1/68
26	Comprehensive Planning for State Education Agencies	**Utah** Colo., Conn., Iowa, Tex., W. Va., P.R.	3/67 - 9/69
41	National Educational Finance Project	**Florida** Mich., Minn., N.H., N. Y., Oreg., Tenn., Tex., Utah	6/68 -
43	Project to Assist in the Support of the Cooperative Development of a Handbook on State Education Agency Information	**Kentucky** All fifty States	2/69 - 11/70

47	Improving State Leadership in Education	**Colorado** Fla., Mich.	6/69 -
50	Accountability of Educational Management: The Use of the Audit Process to Improve the Management of Federally Assisted Educational Programs	**Alabama** Ky., Tex.	5/70 -

(5) Products of Project No. 5 include the following:

McCaffrey, Kenneth J., and Van Dusseldorp, Ralph A., eds. ***Proceedings of the National Conference on State Education Information Systems.*** Iowa City, Iowa, May 9-10, 1966. Des Moines: State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, 1966.

Mitchell, James E., project director. ***MSEIP Data Control System User's and Operator's Manual.*** Des Moines: State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, 1970.

______. ***MSEIP Data Control System Program Specifications, Vols. I and II.*** Des Moines: State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, 1970.

______. ***MSEIP Documentation of Project Development and General System Design***. Des Moines: State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, 1968.

______. ***MSEIP DocumentationSupplement.*** Des Moines: State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, 1970.

______. ***MSEIP FY 1969 Adaptation of Continuation Contract.*** Des Moines: State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, 1968.

———. ***MSEIP 1968 Conference Proceedings.*** Des Moines: State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, 1968.

———. ***MSEIP States' Activities for Fiscal Year 1969.*** Des Moines: State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, 1969.

———. ***1969 Conference Proceedings.*** Des Moines: State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, 1969.

———. ***Proceedings of the MSEIP Demonstration – Workshop Conference.*** Pierre, South Dakota, June 29-July 3, 1970. Des Moines: State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, 1970.

(10) Products of Project No. 10 include the following:

Friedman, Burton D., project director. ***Program-Oriented Information, A Management Systems Complex for State Education Agencies, Part I, Analysis and Proposals.*** Baltimore: State of Maryland, Department of Education, 1966.

Public Administration Service. ***Program-Oriented Information, Part II, Manual of Accounting and Related Financial Procedures.*** Chicago: P.A.S., 1966.

———. ***Program-Oriented Information, Part III, Detailed Systems Documentation.*** Chicago: P.A.S., 1968.

———. ***The Program-Oriented Management Information System: Present Uses and Future Possibilities, Phase II: A Management Systems Complex for State Education Agencies.*** Chicago: P.A.S., 1968.

(26) Products of Project No. 26 include the following:

Dopp, R. Douglas. ***Comprehensive Planning in State Education Agencies: A Connecticut Report.*** Hartford: State of Connecticut, Office of Departmental Planning, Department of Education, 1968.

Furse, Bernarr S., project director. ***How Good Are Utah Public Schools? An Assessment of the Quality of Educational Programs in Utah.*** Salt Lake City: State of Utah, Board of Education, 1967.

Furse, Bernarr S., and Wright, Lyle O., eds. ***Comprehensive Planning in State Education Agencies.*** Salt Lake City: State of Utah, Board of Education, 1968.

Wolvek, Joe. ***Comprehensive Planning in State Education Agencies: A Comprehensive Planning Process for the State Department of Public Instruction.*** Des Moines: State of Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, 1968.

Wright, Lyle O. ***Developing Comprehensive Planning Capability in State Education Agencies.*** Ed. by Bernarr S. Furse, Multi-State Project Director. Salt Lake City: State of Utah, Board of Education, 1969.

B. Mankato State College, with USOE financial assistance, established an Institute which has published a series of *Guides to Planning, A Handbook for State Education Agency Planners* (1971) and other products. Inquiries may be addressed to:

Institute for State Education Agency Planners
Mankato State College
Mankato, Minnesota 56001

Publications include the following:

Institute Staff. ***Evaluation Criteria for Staff Assessment of the Planning Capability of State Education Agencies.*** 1970.

______. ***Handbook for State Education Agency Planners: An Orientation to the Role and Function of Planning.*** 1971.

The *Guides to Planning* Series include the following:

Bush, Donald. ***Planning for Statewide Education Programs*** (Guide No. 7). 1970.

Friedman, Burton D. ***A Guide to Planning State Education Agency Fiscal Operations*** (Guide No. 5). 1971.

———. ***Planning for Management of Fiscal Resources for the State School System*** (Guide No. 9). 1970.

Friedman, Burton D.; Curtis, James; and Duncan, Merlin. ***A Guide to Planning State Education Agency Programs*** (Guide No. 1). 1971.

Gaynor, Gus. ***A Guide To Planning for Materials and Equipment for State Education Agencies*** (Guide No. 4). 1971.

———. ***A Guide To Planning State Education Agency Staff Requirements*** (Guide No. 2). 1971.

Leu, Donald J. ***A Guide To Planning State Education Agency Facilities*** (Guide No. 3). 1971.

———. ***Planning Educational Facilities for the State School System*** (Guide No. 11). 1970.

Marcus, Edward E. ***Planning for Educational Personnel Needs of the State School System*** (Guide No. 10). 1970.

Meriwether, Michael. ***A Guide To Planning Management Activities*** (Guide No. 6). 1971.

Talbot, Walter D. ***Planning for the Management and Administration of Statewide Education Programs*** (Guide No. 8). 1970.

About the Author

BURTON D. FRIEDMAN was a member of the Public Administration Service field staff, 1952–55, and returned as a Principal Associate in 1968. At PAS, he conducts or directs consulting and research projects in educational management or other areas of public administration. Dr. Friedman received his Ph. D. (in the administration of higher education) from Michigan State University, his M.A. in political science from the University of Kentucky, and his B.S. from Northwestern University. He was a fellow of the Southern Regional Training Program in Public Administration, 1947–48, and attended the universities of Alabama and Tennessee.

He has held administrative posts in Kentucky state government and in the University of Puerto Rico; taught at Michigan State and the University of Kansas; engaged in research at Michigan State, the University of San Carlos of Guatemala, and the Maryland State Department of Education; and directed evaluation efforts at the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc. Privately or on behalf of Public Administration Service, Dr. Friedman has performed many consulting assignments in local, state, and national governmental and educational settings, both domestic and foreign.

PAS published his first book, ***Punched Card Primer,*** in 1956. Dr. Friedman is author or co-author of these more recent PAS publications: ***State Planning and Federal Grants*** (1969); ***State Government and Education*** (1971), and ***Grants Management*** (1971). He is the author of ***Program Oriented Information*** (Maryland Department of Education, 1966); several monographs published by the Institute for State Education Agency Planners, Mankato (Minn.) State College, 1970 and 1971; several monographs on education in Central America, published in English and Spanish by the Institute for Educational Research and Improvement, Michigan State University, and the University of San Carlos of Guatemala, 1964–65; and articles in professional journals. Dr. Friedman won the 1969 Louis Brownlow Award of the American Society for Public Administration for his article "Needed: A National Policy Toward Universities of the Underdeveloped World" (***PAR,*** Jan.-Feb., 1968).